

effectively the obligation of the United States under certain treaties relating to the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs, by providing for domestic control of the production and distribution of the opium poppy and its products, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7621. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2530. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers: House Report No. 2531. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7684. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7685. A bill to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7686. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7687. A bill to amend section 1 (C) of Public, 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939; to the committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 7688. A bill to continue the base pay of veterans of the present war for limited period after separation from the service in order to provide an opportunity for readjustment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7689. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution providing for aviation training of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm rural youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7690. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage,

or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7691. A bill authorizing the President to present a Congressional Medal of Honor to Pvt. Leo Joseph Lopacinski; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7692. A bill for the relief of Charles Fred Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 7693. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty of Capt. Walter S. Strange, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1942

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

May I begin my ministry in this office, to which in this crucial hour of the Nation's life you have graciously called me, with a prayer offered where I now stand by my princely predecessor, Dr. Z. Barney T. Phillips, when the Senate was mourning the loss of a distinguished Member. The petitions which fell from his lips then we think of today as applying to him and to his dear ones, and as still linking us to him and to his glorious service as Chaplain of this body across beautiful years. Let us lift our hearts as we offer the prayer of Chaplain Z. Barney Phillips:

PRAYER

"Father of Mercies, whose never failing love alone can heal our wounds, be with us now. Be very near, dear Lord, in this sad hour wherein we pause in loving tribute to the memory of him, our friend, so late our gallant comrade. Vouchsafe him peace and joy in the Paradise of God, and may he go from strength to strength in that life of perfect service. Deal tenderly with her whose love hath ever been to him the earnest of Thy love, that through the shadows Thy staff may be her stay, Thine everlasting arms her sure refuge. Grant unto us who are still in our pilgrimage that purity of intention which sets the seal of a supernatural distinction upon the humblest life, and gird us with prudence and restraint, the holy armor of knights dedicated to a divine adventure.

"When on my day of life the night is falling,

And in the winds from unseen spaces blown,

I hear far voices out of darkness calling
My feet to paths unknown.

Thou who hast made my house of life
so pleasant,

Leave not its tenant when its walls
decay.

O Love Divine, O Helper ever present,
Be Thou my strength and stay.

Suffice it if my good and ill unreckoned
And both forgiven through Thy
abounding grace,

I find myself by hands familiar beckoned
Unto my fitting place."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, October 10, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on October 9, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2584) to permit appointment of White House police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2442) to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. HOBBS, and Mr. GWYNNE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2655) to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. GUYER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOEHNE, Mr. DISNEY, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. KNUTSON, and Mr. REED of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7556) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for

other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 174. An act for the relief of Lyle L. Bressler; and

S. 2203. An act for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7556) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON OCTOBER 12, 1942

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the address delivered on October 12, 1942, by the President of the United States in a Nation-wide broadcast.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As you know, I have recently come back from a trip of inspection of camps and training stations and war factories.

The main thing that I observed on this trip is not exactly news. It is the plain fact that the American people are united as never before in their determination to do a job and to do it well.

This whole Nation of 130,000,000 free men and women and children is becoming one great fighting force. Some of us are soldiers or sailors, some of us are civilians. Some of us are fighting the war in airplanes, 5 miles above the continent of Europe or the islands of the Pacific—and some of us are fighting it in mines deep down in the earth of Pennsylvania or Montana. A few of us are decorated with medals for heroic achievement, but all of us can have that deep and permanent inner satisfaction that comes from doing the best we know how—each of us playing an honorable part in the great struggle to save our democratic civilization.

Whatever our individual circumstances or opportunities—we are all in it, and our spirit is good, and we Americans and our allies are going to win—and do not let anyone tell you anything different.

That is the main thing that I saw on my trip around the country—unbeatable spirit. If the leaders of Germany and Japan could have come along with me, and had seen what I saw, they would agree with my conclusions. Unfortunately, they were unable to make the trip with me. That is one reason why we are carrying our war effort overseas—to them.

With every passing week the war increases in scope and intensity. That is true in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, and on all the seas.

The strength of the United Nations is on the up-grade in this war. The Axis leaders, on the other hand, know by now that they have already reached their full strength, and that their steadily mounting losses in men and material cannot be fully replaced. Germany and Japan are already realizing what the inevitable result will be when the total strength of the United Nations hits them—at additional places on the earth's surface.

One of the principal weapons of our enemies in the past has been their use of what is called "The War of Nerves." They have spread falsehood and terror; they have started

fifth columns everywhere; they have duped the innocent; they have fomented suspicion and hate between neighbors; they have aided and abetted those people in other nations—even our own—whose words and deeds are advertised from Berlin and Tokyo as proof of disunity.

The greatest defense against all such propaganda is the common sense of the common people—and that defense is prevailing.

The "War of Nerves" against the United Nations is now turning into a boomerang. For the first time, the Nazi propaganda machine is on the defensive. They begin to apologize to their own people for the repulse of their vast forces at Stalingrad, and for the enormous casualties they are suffering. They are compelled to beg their overworked people to rally their weakened production. They even publicly admit, for the first time, that Germany can be fed only at the cost of stealing food from the rest of Europe.

They are proclaiming that a second front is impossible; but, at the same time, they are desperately rushing troops in all directions, and stringing barbed wire all the way from the coasts of Finland and Norway to the islands of the eastern Mediterranean.

Meanwhile, they are driven to increase the fury of their atrocities.

The United Nations have decided to establish the identity of those Nazi leaders who are responsible for the innumerable acts of savagery. As each of these criminal deeds is committed, it is being carefully investigated; and the evidence is being relentlessly piled up for the future purposes of justice.

We have made it entirely clear that the United Nations seek no mass reprisals against the populations of Germany or Italy or Japan. But the ring leaders and their brutal henchmen must be named, and apprehended, and tried in accordance with the judicial processes of criminal law.

There are now millions of Americans in Army camps, in naval stations, in factories, and in shipyards.

Who are these millions upon whom the life of our country depends? What are they thinking? What are their doubts and what are their hopes? And how is the work progressing?

The Commander in Chief cannot learn all of the answers to these questions in Washington. That is why I made the trip I did.

It is very easy to say, as some have said, that when the President travels through the country he should go with a blare of trumpets, with crowds on the sidewalks, with batteries of reporters and photographers—talking and posing with all the politicians of the land.

But having had some experience in this war and in the last war, I can tell you very simply that the kind of trip I took permitted me to concentrate on the work I had to do without expending time, meeting all the demands of publicity. And, I might add, it was a particular pleasure to make a tour of the country without having to give a single thought to politics.

I expect to make other trips for similar purposes, and I shall make them in the same way.

In the last war, I had seen great factories; but until I saw some of the new present-day plants, I had not thoroughly visualized our American war effort. Of course, I saw only a small portion of all our plants, but that portion was a good cross section, and it was deeply impressive.

The United States has been at war for only 10 months, and is engaged in the enormous task of multiplying its armed forces many times. We are by no means at full production level yet. But I could not help asking myself on the trip, Where would we be today if the Government of the United States had not begun to build many of its factories for

this huge increase more than 2 years ago—more than a year before war was forced upon us at Pearl Harbor?

We have also had to face the problem of shipping. Ships in every part of the world continue to be sunk by enemy action. But the total tonnage of ships coming out of American, Canadian, and British shipyards, day by day, has increased so fast that we are getting ahead of our enemies in the bitter battle of transportation.

In expanding our shipping, we have had to enlist many thousands of men for our merchant marine. These men are serving magnificently. They are risking their lives every hour so that guns and tanks and planes and ammunition and food may be carried to the heroic defenders of Stalingrad and to all the United Nations' forces all over the world.

A few days ago I awarded the first Maritime Distinguished Service Medal to a young man—Edward F. Cheney, of Yeadon, Pa.—who had shown great gallantry in rescuing his comrades from the oily waters of the sea after their ship had been torpedoed. There will be many more such acts of bravery.

In one sense my recent trip was a hurried one, out through the Middle West, to the Northwest, down the length of the Pacific coast, and back through the Southwest and the South. In another sense, however, it was a leisurely trip, because I had the opportunity to talk to the people who are actually doing the work—management and labor alike—on their own home grounds. It gave me a fine chance to do some thinking about the major problems of our war effort on the basis of first things first.

As I told the three press-association representatives who accompanied me, I was impressed by the large proportion of women employed—doing skilled manual work running machines. As time goes on, and many more of our men enter the armed forces, this proportion will increase. Within less than a year from now, there will probably be as many women as men working in our war-production plants.

I had some enlightening experiences relating to the old saying of us men that curiosity—inquisitiveness—is stronger among women. I noticed that, frequently, when we drove unannounced down the middle of a great plant full of workers and machines, the first people to look up from their work were the men—and not the women. It was chiefly the men who were arguing as to whether that fellow in the straw hat was really the President or not.

Having seen the quality of the work and of the workers on our production lines—and coupling these first-hand observations with the reports of actual performance of our weapons on the fighting fronts—I can say to you that we are getting ahead of our enemies in the battle of production.

Of great importance to our future production was the effective and rapid manner in which the Congress met the serious problem of the rising cost of living. It was a splendid example of the operation of democratic processes in wartime.

The machinery to carry out this act of the Congress was put into effect within 12 hours after the bill was signed. The legislation will help the cost-of-living problems of every worker in every factory and on every farm in the land.

In order to keep stepping up our production, we have had to add millions of workers to the total labor force of the Nation. And as new factories come into operation we must find additional millions of workers.

This presents a formidable problem in the mobilization of manpower.

It is not that we do not have enough people in this country to do the job. The problem is to have the right numbers of the

right people in the right places at the right time.

We are learning to ration materials, and we must now learn to ration manpower.

The major objectives of a sound manpower policy are:

First, to select and train men of the highest fighting efficiency needed for our armed forces in the achievement of victory over our enemies in combat.

Second, to man our war industries and farms with the workers needed to produce the arms and munitions and food required by ourselves and our fighting Allies to win this war.

In order to do this, we shall be compelled to stop workers from moving from one war job to another as a matter of personal preference; to stop employers from stealing labor from each other; to use older men and handicapped people and more women, and even grown boys and girls, wherever possible and reasonable, to replace men of military age and fitness; to train new personnel for essential war work; and to stop the wastage of labor in all nonessential activities.

There are many other things that we can do, and do immediately, to help meet the manpower problem.

The school authorities in all the States should work out plans to enable our high-school students to take some time from their school year and to use their summer vacations to help farmers raise and harvest their crops or to work in the war industries. This does not mean closing schools and stopping education. It does mean giving older students a better opportunity to contribute to the war effort. Such work will do no harm to the students.

People should do their work as near their homes as possible. We cannot afford to transport a single worker into an area where there is already a worker available to do the job.

In some communities employers dislike to employ women. In others they are reluctant to hire Negroes. In still others older men are not wanted. We can no longer afford to indulge such prejudices or practices.

Every citizen wants to know what essential war work he can do the best. He can get the answer by applying to the nearest United States Employment Service office. There are 4,500 of these offices throughout the Nation. They are the corner grocery stores of our manpower system. This network of employment offices is prepared to advise every citizen where his skills and labors are needed most and to refer him to an employer who can utilize them to best advantage in the war effort.

Perhaps the most difficult phase of the manpower problem is the scarcity of farm labor. I have seen many evidences of the fact, however, that the people are trying to meet it as well as possible.

In one community that I visited a perishable crop was harvested by turning out the whole of the high school for 3 or 4 days.

In another community of fruit growers the usual Japanese labor was not available; but when the fruit ripened the banker, the butcher, the lawyer, the garageman, the druggist, the local editor and, in fact, every able-bodied man and woman in the town left their occupations and went out, gathered the fruit, and sent it to market.

Every farmer in the land must realize fully that his production is part of war production and that he is regarded by the Nation as essential to victory. The American people expect him to keep his production up, and even to increase it. We will use every effort to help him to get labor; but, at the same time, he and the people of his community must use ingenuity and cooperative effort to produce crops and livestock and dairy products.

It may be that all of our volunteer effort—however well intentioned and well adminis-

tered—will not suffice to solve the problem. In that case we shall have to adopt new legislation. If this is necessary, I do not believe that the American people will shrink from it.

In a sense every American, because of the privilege of his citizenship, is a part of the selective service.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the selective-service boards. The successful operation of the Selective Service System and the way it has been accepted by the great mass of our citizens give us confidence that, if necessary, the same principle could be used to solve any manpower problem.

And I want also to say a word of praise and thanks for the more than 10,000,000 people, all over the country, who have volunteered for the work of civilian defense—and who are working hard at it. They are displaying unselfish devotion in the patient performance of their often tiresome and always anonymous tasks. In doing this important neighborly work they are helping to fortify our national unity and our real understanding of the fact that we are all involved in this war.

Naturally on my trip I was most interested in watching the training of our fighting forces.

All of our combat units that go overseas must consist of young strong men who have had thorough training. A division that has an average age of 23 or 24 is a better fighting unit than one which has an average age of 33 or 34. The more of such troops we have in the field the sooner the war will be won, and the smaller will be the cost in casualties.

Therefore I believe that it will be necessary to lower the present minimum age limit for selective service from 20 years down to 18. We have learned how inevitable that is, and how important to the speeding up of victory.

I can very thoroughly understand the feeling of all parents whose sons have entered our armed forces. I have an appreciation of that feeling, and so has my wife.

I want every father and every mother who has a son in the service to know—again from what I have seen with my own eyes—that the men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are receiving today the best possible training, equipment, and medical care. And we will never fail to provide for the spiritual needs of our officers and men under the chaplains of our armed services.

Good training will save many, many lives in battle. The highest rate of casualties is always suffered by units comprised of inadequately trained men.

We can be sure that the combat units of our Army and Navy are well manned, and well equipped, and well trained. Their effectiveness in action will depend upon the quality of their leadership and upon the wisdom of the strategic plans on which all military operations are based.

I can say one thing about our plans: They are not being decided by the typewriter strategists who expound their views in the press or on the radio.

One of the greatest of American soldiers, Robert E. Lee, once remarked on the tragic fact that in the war of his day all the best generals were apparently working on newspapers instead of in the Army. That seems to be true in all wars.

The trouble with the typewriter strategists is that, while they may be full of bright ideas, they are not in possession of much information about the facts or problems of military operations.

We, therefore, will continue to leave the plans for this war to the military leaders.

The military and naval plans of the United States are made by the joint staff of the Army and Navy, which is constantly in session in Washington. The chiefs of this staff are Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold. They meet

and confer regularly with representatives of the British joint staff, and with representatives of Russia, China, the Netherlands, Poland, Norway, the British Dominions, and other nations working in the common cause.

Since this unity of operations was put into effect last January, there has been a very substantial agreement between these planners, all of whom are trained in the profession of arms—air, sea, and land—from their early years. As Commander in Chief I have at all times also been in substantial agreement.

As I have said before, many major decisions of strategy have been made. One of them, on which we have all agreed, relates to the necessity of diverting enemy forces from Russia and China to other theaters of war by new offensives against Germany and Japan. An announcement of how these offensives are to be launched, and when, and where, cannot be broadcast over the radio at this time.

We celebrate today the exploit of a bold and adventurous Italian—Christopher Columbus—who with the aid of Spain opened up a New World where freedom and tolerance and respect for human rights and dignity provided an asylum for the oppressed of the Old World.

Today the sons of the New World are fighting in lands far distant from their own America. They are fighting to save for all mankind, including ourselves, the principles which have flourished in this New World of freedom.

We are mindful of the countless millions of people whose future liberty and whose very lives depend upon permanent victory for the United Nations.

There are a few people in this country who, when the collapse of the Axis begins, will tell our people that we are safe once more; that we can tell the rest of the world to "stew in its own juice"; that never again will we help to pull "the other fellow's chestnuts from the fire"; that the future of civilization can jolly well take care of itself insofar as we are concerned.

But it is useless to win battles if the cause for which we fought these battles is lost. It is useless to win a war unless it stays won.

We therefore fight for the restoration and perpetuation of faith and hope throughout the world.

The objective of today is clear and realistic. It is to destroy completely the military power of Germany, Italy, and Japan to such good purpose that their threat against us and all the other United Nations cannot be revived a generation hence.

We are united in seeking the kind of victory that will guarantee that our grandchildren can grow and, under God, may live their lives, free from the constant threat of invasion, destruction, slavery, and violent death.

PLANTING OF GUAYULE AND OTHER RUBBER PLANTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2775) to amend the act of March 5, 1942, relating to the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants, which were, on page 2, line 19, to strike out "subsection" and insert: "subsections"; and on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

(f) The Secretary may lease at reasonable rentals structures erected by the Government with essential facilities for such periods as such structures and facilities are not required for the purposes of this act; and any part of land or structures with essential facilities acquired by lease, deed, or other agreement pursuant to this act, which

are not required or suitable for the purposes of the act during the period the United States is entitled to possession thereof may be leased or subleased at a reasonable rental; and any surplus water controlled by the United States on land owned or leased by the United States for the purposes of this act may be disposed of at reasonable rates.

SEC. 7. Section 2 (a) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "as amended," the following new wording: "(Secs. 321 to 324, inclusive, and section 325a of title 40 of the U. S. Code (1940 ed.), shall not apply to any nursery, planting, cultivating or harvesting operations conducted pursuant to this act.)"

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to move that the Senate concur in the amendments proposed by the House of Representatives. I may say, for the benefit of Senators, that the amendments proposed by the House are consistent with the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture, are merely perfecting amendments, and apply only to some very minor matters. The amendments are rather technical, but I have here a letter from the Department of Agriculture explaining exactly their effects. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, October 9, 1942.

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: I should like to explain to you the purpose of the additional amendments by the House to S. 2775.

The first includes new language in the latter part of section 2 (a) referring to sections 321-324, inclusive, and section 325 (a) of Title 40 of United States Code. The principal purpose of this amendment is to enable us to make contracts with farmers under which they will do a considerable part of the ground preparation and subsequent cultivation and harvesting of guayule on lands leased from them. Negotiations with farmers have shown unwillingness on their part to enter into such arrangements because of the fear that they might be liable under the 8-hour law of 1912 as amended in 1940 for the payment of overtime where the length of day exceeds 8 hours. It appears that the long standing arrangement on California farms is for a straight 10-hour workday. This, I believe, is consistent with the exemption of agricultural workers in the Fair Labor Standards Act, but there seems to be enough of a question involved so as to make it desirable to have this amendment in the guayule bill. It does not in any way affect the rates of pay which have to be those prevalent in localities involved. The same rule, of course, would apply to persons employed by us directly on these activities.

The amendment embraced in section 2 (f) is to authorize us to enable some use to be made of facilities for which we do not at the time have use. We recently had a request for use of some of our structures by lettuce farmers which we could have permitted, but for which we found there was no legal authority.

We are, of course, very anxious to have this legislation brought to final enactment as soon as possible, and I am sure you share that desire.

If there is any further information you need in relation to the above amendments or any other questions, please let me know.

There is one other point. The deficiency appropriation bill, which passed the House

yesterday carrying an item of \$19,000,000 for guayule, has in it a provision for raising the acreage limitation by 25,000. This was inserted by agreement with the House Appropriations Committee so as to be safe in case, for any reason, the amendments to the act of March 5, 1942, were materially delayed.¹

The simplest thing to do now is to let that language stay as it is because our legal advisers here tell me that when the basic act is amended the new 500,000-acre figure will prevail, but even if this is not the case, we will not want to plant as much as 100,000 acres in the fiscal year 1943, to which this \$19,000,000 appropriation is limited. If something should arise later to change this situation, we would no doubt have no difficulty in getting the necessary change in appropriation language should that be required.

Very sincerely yours,

C. M. GRANGER,
Acting Chief, Forest Service.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, unless the majority leader or the minority leader wishes a further explanation, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION AFFECTING AN APPROPRIATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 269)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision to authorize the acquisition, by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, of additional land for the forest-products laboratory at Madison, Wis. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—JUDICIAL ESTABLISHMENT (S. Doc. No. 270)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$75,000, for the judicial establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO THE APPROPRIATION FOR OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 271)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID (S. Doc. No. 272)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriations for defense aid, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 273)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1943, amount-

¹ We have so advised the clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who inquired about it.

C. M. G.

ing to \$4,500 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SERVICING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of action taken to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States for the period ended October 13, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his operations under the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act for the period ended October 11, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (5), and Navy (2); Federal Security Agency (5), Executive Office of the President (Office of Civilian Defense), The National Archives (2), The Panama Canal, and the Federal Security Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the chairman of Social Security of Puerto Rico, Santurce, P. R., praying for the enactment of House bill 7175, to extend Titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Bart Phillips, president, Local 2443, U. S. A., Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Thomas Graham, recording secretary, Local 2443, U. S. A., Congress of Industrial Organizations, Crum Lynne, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing adequate taxes for the prosecution of the war; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

CONSERVATION OF BUTTER FATS—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN CHEESE MAKERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association at Fond du Lac on October 8, 1942.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our all-out war effort of necessity will compel many changes in our economic, industrial, and agricultural life; and

Whereas available supplies of fat is now demanding attention and rumored plans for conserving fat includes the reduction of the fat standards of cheese and butter: Therefore be it,

Resolved by the board of directors of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, hereby records its opposition to the reduction of the butterfat in cheese and butter which will result in the production of an inferior product; be it further

Resolved, That if and when the fat supply requires conservation then we recommend the rationing of the various dairy products.

RELINQUISHMENT OF EXTRATERRITORIALITY RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, believing that the more differences between the Allies which are settled during the wartime the easier will be the peace, on August 17 I suggested that it would be timely for the United States and Great Britain to renounce their rights of extraterritoriality in China. That has been done, according to an announcement from each Government. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of October 12, 1942, may be made a part of my remarks and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 12, 1942]

EXTRALITY

This is the awkward derivative of a ten-dollar word in the language of international relations, extraterritoriality. Yet the word itself is not half so awkward as what it connotes. Extraterritoriality means the principle whereby foreigners are exempt from civil and criminal prosecution under the laws of the country of their residence or sojourn. In other words, they are subject only to the jurisdiction of their own courts—established for this purpose in the country of the foreigner's stay.

The implications of this system for the affected country is imaginable by thinking of what it would mean in America. Imagine British residents in the United States immune from American jurisdiction. Of course, we would not tolerate such an invasion of our sovereignty. Yet China—our great ally in the Far East—has been forced under treaties going back a hundred years to permit foreign courts on her soil for dealing with foreigners residing in China.

Understandably enough, therefore, extrality is a sore point with the Chinese. They have dubbed the treaties conferring this privilege on foreigners as "unequal," as they undoubtedly are. They have described themselves as relegated to a semicolonial status in the family of independent and sovereign nations, and there is warrant in the statement. To be sure, there was a realistic reason for extorting the concession in the nineteenth century. Without extrality, which protected foreigners from the anti-foreignism characteristic of imperial China, western commerce, with its attendant exploitation, with the East could not have thriven. In other words, extrality was a one-way safeguard. But there is no such justification today, especially since we are fighting a war of freedom, for the maintenance of the system. Indeed, as long ago as 1934 the United States expressed a willingness to relinquish extrality in China when

conditions should be favorable therefor; that was to say, when China erased the anarchy arising out of the struggle between the nationalists and war lords.

That has now been accomplished, and, with China's emergence as a great power, extrality has ceased to exist in any de facto sense. Moreover, both Great Britain and the United States have accepted China as a full and equal ally in the war against the Axis. Thus the new treaty which, it is announced, will soon be negotiated with the Chinese providing for the end of the extraterritorial regime, would merely accept and legalize an already accomplished fact.

SENATOR NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at this time—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from New Mexico making an address during the morning hour?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me a few moments ago, and I understand his remarks are to be very brief.

Mr. HATCH. They are to be very brief.

Mr. McNARY. Ordinarily I should object, of course, because speeches before the morning business is concluded are a violation of the rule, but I have no objection to the Senator from New Mexico proceeding.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to say a few words which I believe will express the thought of practically every Member of this body. I also am confident that what I shall say today will express the hope and wish of thousands of men and women residing in every State of this Union. While it may seem that the matter I shall discuss is of a political nature, certainly it does not concern partisan politics to any extent whatever.

The State of Nebraska, Mr. President, throughout the years past has contributed much to the political thought and life of America. Three times she gave to my own party its nominee for President of the United States. Many of her illustrious sons have served our Nation well and honorably in high and important positions of government. Nebraska does have an enviable record in political matters, and, because she has, I trust the suggestion I make today will not be taken amiss but will be received as a reflection of the progressive political life of that great State.

Today, I think Nebraska has a wonderful opportunity to display again to the people of America her nonpartisanship and her concern for the welfare of the Nation. At least, that State does have an opportunity to show that in this time of war, politics—as to one office anyway—has been completely adjoined.

Mr. President, I have met only casually Mr. May, the Democratic nominee for United States Senator from Nebraska. I have not met the Republican nominee. From what I have seen and heard, I must assume that both men are capable and worthy of the office to which they aspire. Certainly all of us here in this Chamber will agree that ambition to sit in this body is a worthy and laudable ambition:

It happens, however, that this year there is a third—or, rather, I should say a first—candidate in Nebraska for the office of Senator. Only recently, in response to many requests and petitions, Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS at last consented to make the race again for United States Senator. He runs, as all Senators know, as an independent, and not under any party organization or emblem.

It is not necessary for me to attempt any eulogy of Senator NORRIS. His long and distinguished record in both Houses of the Congress pays far greater tribute to him and to his career than any words of mine could possibly pay. It is not with thought of his own personal welfare that I speak today. Perhaps it would be better for his own happiness that he retire with the great honors which are already his, and enjoy his remaining years freed from the heavy burdens and responsibilities of public office. Therefore, I am not thinking so much about him personally—although I confess that out of the respect and affection I hold for him, I should gladly aid in his return to this body if I could—but I am thinking more particularly now of our country. America needs Senator NORRIS in the Senate. His vigorous mind, his great ability, and his wise counsel, are needed today, in time of war; but they will be needed far more when peace treaties come before us and the post-war period begins. Our country needs his courage, his proved integrity, and his wealth of experience.

It is true that Senator NORRIS is past 80 years of age. It was in 1903 that he first came to the House of Representatives. In 1913 he began his career in this body. It is true the sands of life are swiftly running for all of us, but Senator NORRIS remains strong, active, and a powerful influence in this body. Those of us who are younger may well run the errands; we can hew the wood and carry the water if we may continue to have the benefit of his ripe judgment and his long experience.

What a wonderful thing it would be, Mr. President, if both the Democratic and Republican nominees in the State of Nebraska would withdraw from the race and let Senator NORRIS be returned to this body without opposition. What a fine and fitting tribute that would be for a great State to pay to a great and distinguished citizen. Truly, Nebraska does have now a splendid opportunity to serve herself and the Nation, as well as to reward a faithful servant who has given his life to the welfare of the people of his State and to his country.

Americans everywhere, regardless of party affiliation, will watch with deep interest the results of the November election in Nebraska. I know thousands of them are hoping—and many of them are praying—that in this hour of greatest need for unselfish patriotic statesmanship, America and the world will not lose the services of one whose entire public career has been devoted to the welfare of man, and to liberty and freedom for all the peoples of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the peculiar character of our Federal system accounts for peculiar incidents. Under

the terms of the Constitution the Senate is made the judge of the qualifications of its own Members. When one is elected by a State and takes the oath as a Senator he is not only an ambassador from that State, and a representative of its citizenry, but he is a part of the Government of the United States as well. I believe, therefore, we would not be considered as committing an impropriety if, in our capacity as partners in the Federal scheme of government, we should express a word of appreciation concerning a fellow Member and a colleague.

I am not ashamed to be a proud member of a great party. I believe in the party system. However, Mr. President, I should regret to see the time ever come when our policies and our personnel were determined only by considerations of party and partisanship. I believe, therefore, that today the whole Nation turns its eyes upon the State of Nebraska, because it has a very keen interest in the choice which Nebraska will make in the future concerning its senior senatorship.

Mr. President, one of the distinctions of being a Member of this great body is not only that of having a seat in it but in having the privilege of association with the great minds, great hearts, and great characters who constitute this body. The United States Senate has gained its recognition not alone by the power it possesses, but principally by the strength of mind and spirit of those who have been honored to sit and to speak here.

We all know that there is no name higher on the roster of honor and distinction in the country's estimate than that of Nebraska's senior Senator, the venerable, the good, and the great GEORGE W. NORRIS. To recite a record of his achievements as a legislator and as a statesman would be merely to recount the record of progressivism in America; for over a generation he has been allied with or has been the impulse of nearly every progressive cause which has come to the consciousness of and received subsequent approval by our people. He is one who has been big enough to rise above the restraints of interest, either in behalf of himself or his State.

Many of us have been keenly gratified as we have seen in Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS a realization of the aspirations of the framers of the Constitution, a United States Senator who was a man worthy to be a Senator, a man who has exhibited statesmanship in his daily conduct, and has honored the high office of United States Senator.

Mr. President, I venture to say that upon reviewing the record in this body of Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, his unselfish service to his country in peace and in war, as a citizen and as a patriot, we know that no other could be found in all the citizenry, not only of Nebraska but of America, who could so honor the office of senior Senator from Nebraska. Therefore, as an ardent Democrat, as one who believes in the Democratic Party and in the party principle, I say that there is no Democrat who is big enough or good enough to succeed Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS in his lifetime.

I would not vote for the President of the United States to oust that man from

his illustrious seat and service while God shall spare him for other great contributions to his country in war and in peace.

I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that I have committed no impropriety, as a fellow Senator and a colleague, in expressing, humbly, words of appreciation for one who more than any other Member of this body, if I may say it without being misunderstood, gives character and integrity to the United States Senate. This good man, who has grown "in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man," will, I hope, continue to be, as long as he may be spared, the senior Senator from Nebraska.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT A BILL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may be allowed to report an appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate, if it should recess over from today until a later day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may or may not object. Of course, if consent is given, and the bill shall be reported, it can be brought up for consideration Thursday by motion, if we take a recess to Thursday at the conclusion of business today. At that time probably the report of the hearings will not be printed. If the bill were then laid before the Senate for immediate consideration, no opportunity would be given to study the bill and the hearings. I should join in the consent requested if it were provided that the bill should go over for 1 day, or until Monday, if Senators desired to have time to study it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is perfectly reasonable.

Mr. McNARY. Then, with the understanding that the Senator may have permission to file the report, and upon the request of any Senator not familiar with the record or the bill, it may go over until the next session of the Senate, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With that understanding, it is, without objection, so ordered.

THE DRAFTING OF MEN 18 AND 19 YEARS OF AGE—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the benefit of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, that tomorrow morning, at 10:30 o'clock, we will begin hearings on the bill interesting itself in the drafting of men 18 and 19 years old, the bill being, one might say, in addition to the selective service law under which we are now operating. Tomorrow these hearings will begin. They will be public hearings. Likewise we shall consider proposals for manpower legislation. There are several bills dealing with that subject now before us, and they will be taken up as soon as we can possibly reach them.

Mr. President, the subject of the drafting of young men 18 and 19 years old, as we know, interests itself in the subject of manpower, and I merely wanted this opportunity to notify all the members of the Military Affairs Committee that there are to be hearings held and

conducted by the full committee, and not by a subcommittee, and that the hearings will be open. Of course, from time to time the committee members will decide about executive sessions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume so far as the draftsmanship of the measure is concerned it will be a very simple matter. It simply reduces the minimum age from 20 years to 18 years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a simple matter, so far as the legislative draftsmanship of the measure is concerned. Of course, the question of policy is one about which the committee will want to have hearings.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. My attention was temporarily diverted. Was it the purpose of the Senator from North Carolina to hold hearings on the plan to draft boys 18 and 19 years of age?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And is it the purpose of the Senator to report the bill and ask for action immediately?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, we assume that it will take some time for the examination of the witnesses who will from time to time or from day to day be called before the committee. As to how long it will take to complete the hearings I have not now the slightest idea, because I have not been advised by the author of the bill, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] as to how many witnesses he proposes to have come before the committee. Furthermore, as in other cases, no doubt members of the committee will receive communications from heads of organizations who will want to be heard as representatives of their organizations, and appear for or against the policy enunciated, so to speak, in the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, yes. Mr. President, that hardly answers my inquiry. I think it is very important that we have some understanding, in view of the remarks made by the able Democratic leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] a few days ago. A number of Members of the Senate of the Republican faith have conferred with me, and I have said, in view of what has occurred here, that I did not assume any major legislation would come before the Senate in the next 2 weeks. Upon the strength of that assertion, which was made on the basis of reliable information, indisputable information, many Senators have departed from the city. If we are now going to take up a matter so important as the drafting of young boys, I want to know it now. I am addressing my remarks to the chairman of the committee who will more or less have the decision with respect to when the proposed legislation will be considered by the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am rather of the opinion that the hearings will be somewhat extensive, for the reason that the subject of drafting 18- and 19-year-old men enters primarily into

the very broad subject of manpower. I am, therefore, of the personal opinion that many of the members of the committee will wish to direct inquiries to the witnesses from time to time along the lines of manpower. We have now several bills before our committee pertaining to the broad subject of manpower, one introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAIT], one by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and one by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. As to when the hearings will be completed, it will be absolutely impossible to provide the able Senator from Oregon with a definite answer.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. The Senator is now covering the identical ground I had in mind. I should suppose the committee would treat the subjects of manpower and the drafting of young men in a comprehensive way. Both subjects come within the comprehension of the larger term. That is what I want to know. If it is going to be the manpower bill which is to be formulated, I have every reason to imagine that it will not be brought up for some weeks, but if the Senator is going to isolate the bill to the drafting of boys 18 and 19, apart from the manpower bill, and bring it before the Senate within a few days, I want to know about it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, as I stated at the outset, we will begin hearings on the subject tomorrow, but naturally, in view of the fact that the matter of the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years old interests itself in the broad subject of manpower, members of the committee will, as a consequence thereof, I assume, direct inquiries to the witnesses upon the point of considering the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years old as a part of the subject of manpower.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should think the chairman of the committee, able as he is, would have something more definite to offer than what he assumes Senators will do. What is the purpose and policy of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The meetings will be held for the purpose of considering now the bill providing for the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years old.

Mr. McNARY. With the idea of bringing in a bill separate and apart from the manpower bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I assume that to be the idea at the present time.

Mr. McNARY. Is that the Senator's purpose?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my purpose.

Mr. McNARY. And to have the bill before the Senate next week, if the Senator can?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, no; I cannot say that. I imagine it will take several weeks to hear all the witnesses. I rather surmise it will take 3 or 4 weeks to hear all the witnesses. A great many witnesses will be called.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not discuss matters on the floor which are childish and puerile. I am trying to act in the capacity of advising faithfully, honestly, and wisely, as I have always tried to do, the Members who confer with me. I want to know if the Senator in-

tends to bring this bill into the Senate next week or the week following. If so, I shall make different arrangements and give different advice to the Senators who are here and to those who have absented themselves.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that it will take several weeks to hear all the witnesses who will be called and the witnesses who will desire to be heard. Then it will be necessary to get all the members of the Military Affairs Committee together finally to cast a vote in executive session as to whether they favor the measure or oppose it.

Mr. McNARY. What is the Senator's present attitude and purpose?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My present attitude and purpose is to give those in favor of the bill and those opposed to the bill an opportunity to be heard, after which we shall endeavor to have a vote in executive session on the question of whether Senators favor the measure or oppose it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is treating the matter very flippantly. I like the chairman of a committee to answer a question seriously with the idea that he may or may not inconvenience Members of the Senate. I assume that the Senator does not know what he wants to do or what he intends to do. I should like him to be perfectly frank and open and candid with me in respect to an inquiry which involves a policy and the convenience of Members of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that it is our purpose to have hearings exclusively on the question of drafting men 18 and 19 years old. That is the desire of the author of the bill, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and I told him this morning that I would be glad to come here and join him tomorrow morning.

Mr. McNARY. When does the Senator, as chairman of the committee, expect to have the bill on the floor of the Senate for consideration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should say within 4 or 5 weeks.

Mr. McNARY. And not earlier?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Hardly earlier than that.

Mr. McNARY. And not earlier?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not earlier than that.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question of manpower legislation and of lowering the draft age has been one which has been bootled around for quite a while in the press, and in talks on the floor of the Senate, and speeches elsewhere. Personally I do not think the two questions are necessarily connected so far as legislation is concerned.

I realize that the reduction of the age limit from 20 to 18 years is connected with the manpower situation; but the President in his address last night announced that he was going to try the voluntary system of solving the manpower question for a while yet, and that if it

could not be solved in that way, he would then ask for legislation dealing with the matter.

Mr. President, the President has now announced that young men from 18 to 20 years of age should be subject to selective service, and I think that is what we have been waiting for, because we felt that as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy we ought to consult him, and at least give him an opportunity to advise the Congress of what his views are upon that subject. I assume we are going to pass a law on the subject. I have stated repeatedly that, so far as I am concerned, whenever the President of the United States, following the advice given him by his military and naval advisers, recommends the lowering of the draft age, I shall feel it my duty to support it, and that it would be no doubt the purpose of Congress to support it. I still adhere to that view. I do not believe it is necessary to couple a bill on that subject with a bill on the subject of manpower, because, while they are connected in a way, they are not necessarily connected legislatively.

Last night the President made a very cogent argument in favor of the reduction of the draft age. I accept that view. I think the country will accept it. That being true, in my judgment, the sooner we put the law on the statute books the better. To be perfectly frank, I see no reason for delaying consideration of that bill until after the election.

It seems that everybody is afraid to mention the word "election," tiptoeing around it as though it were thin ice which might break through. We are at war; and I do not believe Congress ought to have its mind on the election, so far as any necessary legislation is concerned. It may be that in the very nature of things, if there were no election in prospect, and if we did not have to consider it or think about it under the Constitution, as we are required to do, 3 or 4 weeks might be required for the committee to hold hearings on the bill to reduce the age and bring the bill before the Senate. I do not know why it should take that long to consider the mere question of reducing the age limit by 2 years.

Nevertheless, it is not my province to suggest how long the committee should take. However, I think it would be most unfortunate for the Congress, the country, and everyone concerned for the committee deliberately to postpone consideration of the bill and try to hook it up with another subject which, according to the President's address last night, is not yet ready for legislation, merely because an election will occur in the next 3 or 4 weeks. I do not believe the Senator from North Carolina had that in mind.

The other day I announced that I did not know when the President would ask for legislation on the subject of manpower. I was acting upon information which I then had—or lack of information. I had received no information about any recommendation for lowering the age limit. Therefore I could not tell how long Members who felt called

upon to absent themselves could be assured that there would be no important legislation before us. Last week I expressed the view that it would be 3 or 4 weeks before important legislation would be brought before the Senate. I appreciate the desire of Senators to know about the situation.

I realize that Members who live far away from Washington and take advantage of a lull to go home would like to know, and have a right to know, if possible, approximately when they may be called back. I realize that it is impossible now to fix a day on which they should be called back, if necessary, to vote on the bill in question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to make myself clear—

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that the sooner the committee can decide when it will report the bill so that it may be taken up on the floor of the Senate, the better it will be for everybody. I am perfectly willing to abide by the decision of the committee and its chairman on that subject. I am sure there is no purpose on the part of the Senator from North Carolina to withhold information.

Mr. REYNOLDS. None whatever. I do not know how many witnesses will appear. I do not know how many witnesses the author of the bill wishes to call. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is the author of the bill. I do not know how many witnesses he will present or how long a time their testimony will require.

Speaking for myself, I am willing to vote tomorrow on the question of drafting boys of 18 and 19. No one can say that I am trying to evade the issue. I have made up my mind what I shall do about it. I should like to state my opinion now. I will vote to draft boys 18 and 19 years old because the Army says we must have them. The President says we must have them. I am putting all my confidence in our military leaders. If we do not put our confidence in the men upon whom we rely to win the war for us, we may as well quit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The President said he wanted to draft boys of 18 and 19. The Army has said that it wants them. I am willing to vote tomorrow to draft boys of 18 and 19.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's frankness. I take the same position. While this matter has been under discussion we have been waiting for weeks to hear, through the Commander in Chief, the views of the Army and Navy. We now have them. I am ready to vote. I do not have to have any hearings.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am willing to vote tomorrow. At the same time, I can very well appreciate the inquiry of the leader of the minority, in view of the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do, too.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that whatever the Committee on Military Affairs does is perfectly agreeable to me. I always endeavor to abide, and do abide, by the majority decision of the members of the committee. As every member of that

committee will no doubt testify, I have always tried to lean over backward to please every member of the committee. I do not wish to say that the bill will be before the Senate tomorrow or next day without first talking with the Senator from South Dakota, the author of the bill, and finding out how many witnesses he wishes to call. Unfortunately, the Senator from South Dakota is not now present. He is absent on official business. This morning he talked with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself and other members of the Military Affairs Committee, and, as author of the bill, requested that I take the floor today and announce that we shall begin hearings tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make an additional statement. The President has asked for legislation reducing the draft-age limit. He has not asked for legislation dealing with manpower. Therefore, I do not believe that the legislation for which he has asked ought to be delayed because of some other legislation for which he has not asked, although the two subjects may be related in the final adjustment of the war program. I think it would be most unfortunate to delay the bill for which he has asked, waiting for one for which he has not asked.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In that connection, it had been the intention of the chairman to suggest to members of the Military Affairs Committee that immediately after completing consideration of the bill before us dealing with the proposed reduction of the draft age, we take up the Hill bill, the Austin bill, and other bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think probably I should make a further observation. I am not appealing to the chairman of the committee to defer action. I simply wish to know approximately when action will be undertaken. I am ready to vote now. I am just as brave as are other Senators. I have never seen any reason to retreat from the question. All I wish to know is something positive and definite. Upon that I insist. I am not asking that the bill be made a companion or first cousin of the manpower bill. The two bills embrace one large subject. The question of manpower is related to the question of taking men from civilian life and placing them in the Army. Manpower is a civilian question. The whole subject should be explored. I do not mean by that that the whole subject should be comprehended in one bill, or that one bill should immediately follow the other. However, a committee which wishes to do a good job must consider the whole economic, social, and political question involved in manpower and the draft.

I always try to cooperate with the very eloquent and distinguished majority leader. He assured our colleagues that 2 or 3 weeks would elapse before any legislation of importance would be undertaken. On the strength of that advice, and my statement on the floor, several of my colleagues have left for

their homes. All I want to know is, Shall I call them back? Have we changed our plans? I shall not criticize if the plans have been changed. I want something definite and certain. I think I have obtained a final and definite answer from the very handsome, clever, but sometimes elusive Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield for a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to suggest to the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee that the question of drafting men down to 18 years of age is more or less inextricably related to the general subject of how large an army the ultimate objective is to be. I find a great deal of public uncertainty on the subject, and a great deal of public anxiety over stories that we are aiming at an army of from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 men. I find a great deal of perplexity in the public mind as to the necessity or wisdom of an effort of such magnitude. I wish to suggest to the able chairman of the committee that, for the sake of an intelligent public opinion in relation to the draft problem, and in behalf of a more willing acceptance of this very difficult decision to reach down into the juvenile years for our soldier manpower, in the course of the hearings, so far as may be possible without the disclosure of necessary military secrets, the country should be given as much of the truth as possible regarding the total military prospectus which is being planned.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GURNEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry I was not in the Chamber at the start of the session today; as a result I have only a second-hand knowledge of the debate previous to my entering the Chamber, when the question of lowering the selective-service age of those liable for military service was under discussion. I understand my bill, which is now before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, was mentioned.

Personally, I do not believe anyone can at this moment predict accurately when the committee may be able to conclude the hearings on the bill. I sincerely believe that everyone who, by any stretch of the imagination, has any worth-while information on which the committee could base its judgment, should be invited to give testimony to the committee. I feel that we should give plenty of time to the representatives of the armed services, the Selective Service Board, and any other Government bureau which is working on the manpower question.

Certainly no one should hold up the report of the committee to the Senate any longer than is absolutely necessary. I am sure that, in view of the President's radio address last evening, we are all now quite certain that time is of the essence

and that the Congress should expedite consideration of the subject and act just as rapidly as possible. I am hoping that will be the case.

EXTRAVAGANCE AND WASTE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE PROJECTS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a constituent of mine has asked that I place in the RECORD a copy of a letter which he wrote to the Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy. The letter calls attention to the extravagance and waste occurring at the Farragut Naval Training Station in northern Idaho. The letter is typical of other letters and reports which have come to me from various places in the country where such projects are being carried on. I know that the Truman Committee has investigated many such projects, and I think it has done an excellent job; but I am sure that the scope of its investigation has been limited by time, and probably by resources.

At this time I desire to read to the Senate a portion of the letter:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to call to your attention some quaint (very quaint) customs and conditions existing at the Farragut Naval Training Station in northern Idaho. I gathered this information while serving there as a painter recently.

The only boss painter in the project who insisted on the men working was fired while I was there.

I was socially ostracized by the other painters because I insisted on working. The idea seems to be to make the job last as long as possible, and to hell with the war.

The paint is a powder base first cousin to kalsomine disguised as a lead base paint by adding clay and sand in order to bring the weight up to standard. One investigator told me: "This paint has so much sand in it that it ruins a saw to saw a board that has been painted with it."

The brushes flare out like a whisk broom as soon as they become wet. One investigator (there are evidently hundreds of them) examined my brush under a microscope and then said, "How do you do it?" I said, "How do I do what?" He said, "Paint with the end of a horse's tail on a stick."

The writer of the letter further said:

Soldiering is not confined to the painters. The landscape and road crews make a regular practice of building roads and parade grounds and then plowing them up and starting all over again.

When I first went to work we painted the window sash before it was installed, but this method was too fast. Now they first install the sash. Then remove them and paint them, and then reinstall them.

Then the writer of the letter proceeds to describe living conditions at the training station.

Another paragraph of his letter reads as follows:

The day I quit I had the flu from living in unheated quarters and was too ill to go to the office and stand in line for hours for my check so came on home and have been trying to collect my wages ever since. My letters are ignored. This is another established Butler custom.

Apparently the company is the Butler company.

One man tried to quit and get his money 3 days in succession but there were so many others standing in line trying to quit

that he had to abandon the idea and go back to work for the duration.

P. S.: Due to dust and living conditions many people have died and hundreds have lost their health for life from working at Farragut. Nails lay over the ground everywhere and good building material is wasted and burned while the workers freeze in tents, trailers, etc.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT., October 5, 1942.

HON. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to call to your attention some quaint (very quaint) customs and conditions existing at the Farragut Naval Training Station in northern Idaho. I gathered this information while serving there as a painter recently.

The only boss painter in the project who insisted on the men working was fired while I was there.

I was socially ostracized by the other painters because I insisted on working. The idea seems to be to make the job last as long as possible, and to hell with the war.

The paint is a powder base first cousin to kalsomine disguised as a lead base paint by adding clay and sand in order to bring the weight up to standard. One investigator told me: "This paint has so much sand in it that it ruins a saw to saw a board that has been painted with it."

The brushes flare out like a whisk broom as soon as they become wet. One investigator (there are evidently hundreds of them) examined my brush under a microscope and then said, "How do you do it?" I said, "How do I do what?" and he said, "Paint with the end of a horse's tail on a stick." I told him that painting was a gift with me. I could paint with anything and then I was descended from a long line of painters with sticks on the end of a horse's tail or painters with the end of a horse's tail on a stick. He assured me that they were paying good prices for these horse's tails on the end of sticks.

The vigilance of the guards is astounding. Although they are supposed to check the identification badges of each worker when they enter the grounds, one morning a guard stood in the door of my bus which was packed with about 50 men, flashed his light over the passengers in the front seats and said, "Well, I see at least a half dozen of you son-of-a— have badges," and told the bus driver to roll along.

Soldiering is not confined to the painters. The landscape and road crews make a regular practice of building roads and parade grounds and then plowing them up and starting all over again.

When I first went to work we painted the window sash before it was installed, but this method was too fast. Now they first install the sash. Then remove them and paint them, and then reinstall them.

The Butler Co. is evidently not interested in transportation problems. Thousands of cars leave and enter each day with one or two passengers, while hundreds of workers have to quit as I did because they cannot get transportation. The woman at the Signal gas station in Sandpoint, Idaho, who has the franchise for furnishing transportation, does not fulfill this obligation but spends most of her time trying to look as much like Hedy Lamarr as possible, and insulting everyone who asks a civil question. To her the workers are Bayview bums just looking for a soft place to light.

The cafe owners in Sandpoint should be hanged for the prices they charge and kind of service they render.

The condition of the short-cut road between Sandpoint and Farragut is absolutely criminal and could be put in good condition in a few days with proper equipment, but neither Butler nor the Idaho State Highway Department are interested.

The merchandising system is the same now that about 20,000 workers have arrived, as it was when Athol and Bayview were wide places in the road. Mail lays in the rustic post offices for days or weeks before it is delivered. The stores are always sold out of most everything. One morning when I went into the store in Bayview the only thing they had in stock was cabbage, so I went to Athol and bought an artichoke for my lunch. The reason I did not try to buy my lunch at one of the area lunch counters is because they are made and operated on a plan designed to serve about 200 men instead of 2,000. All I ever got out of trying to buy a lunch there was bunions and flat feet from standing in line for hours, only to find when I finally reached the counter that they were sold out of everything but Smith Brothers cough drops. They are supposed to contain vitamins according to the label, but they do not make a satisfactory lunch. Although the eating and transportation problems could be cleared up in 3 days, nothing is done about it.

The occupants of the trailer camps cannot obtain fuel, and scarlet fever and typhoid are said to be rampant, but that is O. K. too. One inmate told me that the only thing he had got out of working for Butler was a total loss of confidence in democracy and a lot of hair on his chest from living in a hollow log without food, heat, or shelter. In short, conditions in these camps are beyond description. I am sure great care was taken to shield the President's sensitive vision from these eyesores. While all this is going on dozens of buildings are vacant on the project. One of the barracks was fixed up for living quarters. They made chicken-netting beds for which they charge \$5 per week, and the victim has to walk 1½ miles each morning and night to eat, provided he can get anything to eat after he arrives.

Among some of the other good old American customs is the custom of forcing everyone to join a union. The unions have collected enough from Farragut workers to finance their own government for 50 years, and given nothing in return.

The day I quit I had the flu from living in unheated quarters and was too ill to go to the office and stand in line for hours for my check, so came on home and have been trying to collect my wages ever since. My letters are ignored. This is another established Butler custom. One man tried to quit and get his money 3 days in succession, but there were so many others standing in line trying to quit that he had to abandon the idea and go back to work for the duration.

By far the quaintest and most profitable custom of Mr. Butler is to deduct 10 percent from the workers' weekly pay for War bonds and then refuse to deliver the bonds until the victim threatens to murder the paymaster. Some of these men have not drawn a bond for months. I presume Mr. Butler (the great mental giant and building genius, the great farsighted American, etc.) cleans up with this money he withholds, even if he only gets 2 percent.

Hoping you and Mr. Butler will some day have bunions and flat feet from standing in a bread line, I am,

Yours truly,

BEN BAKER,
Thompson Falls, Mont.

P. S.—Due to dust and living conditions, many people have died and hundreds have lost their health for life from working at Farragut. Nails lay over the ground everywhere

and good building material is wasted and burned while the workers freeze in tents, trailers, etc.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I also desire to refer—and I have called this matter to the attention of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]—to conditions in a camp in Wyoming generally known as "Little Tokyo." Just before I left Montana, I talked with a newspaper man. He told me that four or five men from the little town of Red Lodge went to work at the camp known as "Little Tokyo." They were there 5 or 6 days before they could be put to work, because they had no lumber. Eight box cars of lumber were supposed to come in. When they came in, all of them were sealed, and were marked "lumber." In the absence of the boss, or whoever was in charge, the boys broke the seals and opened the lumber cars. The newspaper man who spoke to me said that of the eight cars, only four had lumber in them; the others had not a stick of lumber in them. He said that of four more cars which came in, only two had lumber in them. He also told of the extravagance and waste occurring. He said that nails were being dumped on the ground by workers who wanted nails of a different size. Lumber was being wasted, as well; and all that was a result of having work done on the basis of cost-plus-a-reasonable-fee.

If the instances of which I have spoken were the only two of that sort which had been called to my attention, I should hesitate to mention them on the floor of the Senate. The man who spoke to me said he had written to the Department of Justice describing what was going on in "Little Tokyo," and saying that someone should be prosecuted. He told me that up to the time he saw me nothing had been heard from the Department of Justice. He said he had taken up the matter with Mr. Hoover, and that Mr. Hoover said it would be turned over to the Criminal Division, but that he had heard nothing further.

When I was in Montana, I was told of similar experiences and instances in northern Idaho—cases of the payment of exorbitant prices for rental of trucks and busses. One instance was so extreme that it seemed almost impossible; but I was given assurance that it was true—an instance of paying for several months \$800 for the use of a truck with a tank on it, used as a stationary water wagon. Subsequently the rental was cut down to \$400. The truck was not moved. The man in charge started up the engine when he came on shift, then shut off the engine, and merely stayed there; and the next man who came on shift likewise started up the engine and then stopped it again.

As I said to the Senate once before, an Army officer drove all the way from California to Montana in order to buy trucks. He purchased for \$700 one second-hand truck which had been driven 7,000 miles, and had cost \$875, according to my information. That would not have been so bad, perhaps; but he called my attention to the fact that at an old C. C. C. camp which had just been closed approximately 30 trucks of all

types were lying idle—some of them large trucks. I could hardly believe that, but I went there and counted them. There were 35 trucks.

Some of them were large trucks, others were small, and some had pick-up bodies; but they were standing in the open, in the rain and sleet, and at about the time when snowfall begins in that region. They had simply been left there; no use was being made of them.

Those are instances of things which are breaking down the morale of the people of the country more than would be done by anything else that could happen. Unless such things are stopped we shall have a break-down of morale. After all, the little things that people see are the things that impress them. They cannot and do not visualize a billion dollars, but they can see things of the kind I have mentioned happening right under their noses. Those are the things which impress them and make them say, "Why should we buy bonds, why should we buy stamps, when this waste and extravagance is going on right under our noses?"

That is the reason why so many working men in the country "soldier" on jobs when they see the extravagance and waste their bosses are causing. They say, "After all, the Government is paying for it, and the boss is making more money because of the fact that the job takes longer, and why should we worry about it?" So the "soldiering" process starts, and goes down the line.

I do not know who is responsible for such conditions; but certainly there is a lack of coordination between the various departments, and certainly a tremendous amount of waste and extravagance is occurring from one end of the country to the other—waste and extravagance which have aroused the people of the country to such an extent that they are beginning to wonder whether those who are in charge really want to win the war, or whether they are doing everything they can to sabotage our defense efforts and to prevent us from winning the war.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. Let me ask whether the Senator from Montana is a contractor or a carpenter?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I have never been in the contracting business or in the carpentry business.

Mr. GUFFEY. Then, if the Senator wanted to build a house, he would not know how to do so. Let me point out that a moment ago reference was made to painting window sash before it was fitted, not afterward. Does not the Senator know that it is quite common practice among good carpenters and builders to fit the sash, take it out, paint it, and put it up again? If that is not done, a considerable amount of extra work is required.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know.

Mr. GUFFEY. But the Senator is referring to that as bad management.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I am.

Mr. GUFFEY. In the carpentry and building trades it is quite customary to do the work in that way. That is all I wanted to point out.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not a carpenter nor a painter, and I do not know anything about the matter; but the man who wrote the letter I read is a contractor and a painter, and has been a painter all his life. Because I know that he is a painter and contractor, I assume that when he writes to me, his criticism is a valid one. He is an old-time contractor and painter, and has been in the business much longer, and knows much more about it, I am sure, than does the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has had actual experience. He has not merely seen such work from car windows, but he has been at it all his life, and has done nothing else all his life. His father, before him, was a painter and contractor. Not only that, but I think that his grandfather was a carpenter, painter, and a contractor. So, he should know something about it.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is immaterial to me; but I should like to tell the Senator from Montana that every year for 18 years I had a building program under my direction, and I am familiar with the common practice of building and fitting window sash, the practice which the Senator is so anxious to criticize on the basis of information coming from a contractor. Of course, the fact that I was an oil contractor and builder has nothing to do with the illustration.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator has said about his experience in the building business somewhat reminds me of a Russian who talked to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], former Senator Cutting, and me, when we were visiting in Russia in 1930, as I recall.

We went into a community where there was a large manufacturing industry. A man who had formerly lived in Montana was the consulting engineer there. He told us that one of the workers in the factory would like to speak to us. One of the first questions he asked was what was our business before we went to the Senate of the United States? The Senator from Kentucky spoke up and said, "I was a farmer boy." The Russian said, "I suppose like Leo Tolstoy," meaning "a gentleman farmer." Of course it was impossible for him to conceive how a farmer boy raised on a farm, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was, could ever get to the United States Senate; he thought he had to be a gentleman farmer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many people in this country do not yet understand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I think there are many people in the country beginning to wonder how any of us got here so far as that is concerned. [Laughter.] But I am afraid the Senator from Pennsylvania in the contracting business building houses and having them painted was a good deal like the gentleman farmer, Tolstoy, was to the Russian.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to say, for the Senator's information, that I started in as an office boy at the office of a natural gas company at

\$5 a week, and came up the hard way; and I love to talk about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that the morning hour may not be taken to show how little Senators may know about painting and similar matters, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have a letter which I should like to have read into the Record, but I presume this is not the proper time.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2626. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638).

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2618. A bill to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1639).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 9, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2275. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant national service life insurance in the cases of certain Navy or Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941; and

S. 2679. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, incident to secret or confidential orders, and for other purposes.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE AMENDMENTS NUMBERED PRINT OF THE REVENUE ACT

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Senate amendments numbered print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there shall be printed 3,500 additional copies of the Senate amendments numbered print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room, 500 copies for the use of the Com-

mittee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON PATENTS TO FILE REPORT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Committee on Patents held an important hearing wherein the committee was considering certain legislation with respect to patents urgently recommended by the War Department. I think that the report of the Committee on Patents will be ready today or tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that the report on the bill (S. 2794) to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes, may be received by the Senate during the recess if it is available at that time, so that it may be on the calendar for Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2844. A bill to further amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 2845. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include citrus fruit and trees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2846. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an annuity for disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 2847. A bill to authorize the President to acquire vehicles and other transportation equipment and supplies necessary for the successful prosecution of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 2848. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2849. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS AGAINST OPERATORS OF GOLD AND SILVER MINES

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2802) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7672) making

supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To be inserted at the proper place:

"FOREST SERVICE

"Forest products: Not to exceed \$30,000 of the appropriation for experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, fiscal year 1943, shall be available for the acquisition of additional land adjacent to the present site of said laboratory at Madison, Wis."

MOBILIZATION OF THE TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mr. KILGORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 303) which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved. That the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee is authorized and directed to study the possibilities of better mobilizing the technological resources of the United States, for the more efficient prosecution of the war. The subcommittee shall report to the Military Affairs Committee at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to borrow from Government agencies and departments such special assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$2,500, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

HOSPITAL NEEDS AND FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ADJACENT AREA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 302) submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on October 10, 1942, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government, by concentrating its tremendous war activities in the city of Washington and the metropolitan area surrounding the District of Columbia, has brought a vast increase in population estimated at over a million persons within the area; and

Whereas the public utilities and public services to accommodate this vast army of persons has not kept pace with that increase; and

Whereas one of the major and most important fields of service, vital to the health and well-being of the community which has failed to meet the enlarging demands upon it because of inadequate housing, personnel, materials, and equipment, is that of local hospitalization; and

Whereas the number of physicians, surgeons, dental surgeons, nurses, and other

practitioners of the healing arts available to the public and to institutions is steadily decreasing by the call to service in the armed forces of the Nation; and

Whereas the crowded conditions, and in many instances in many parts of the area the unsanitary living accommodations, the complete upheaval of the normal economic and civic life of the city caused by the enormous problem of keeping the war effort at a maximum of efficiency, are the source of a serious menace to the health of the area; and

Whereas such a menace might easily become an epidemic; and

Whereas in the opinion of many leaders of this community such an epidemic might easily become a reality; and

Whereas not only the health and the life of the entire populace, civilian and military, will be endangered, but the war effort will come to a virtual standstill if such condition obtains; and

Whereas the need for additional buildings, nurses' homes, nurses, student nurses, sterilizing and surgical equipment, ambulances, and hospital beds has been forcibly brought to the forefront on numerous occasions by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia through public meetings, personal conferences and contacts with officials of the Federal Security Agency, Federal Works Agency, the Public Health Service, the District Commissioners, and other Government agencies and officials, and through correspondence, telegrams, and other modes of communication, which conferences and contacts and correspondence have demonstrated the urgent need for such expansion of hospital facilities, and at the same time has brought forth no definite or tangible results; and

Whereas it would appear that notwithstanding all of the apparent need and emergency, nothing has been done to assure against possible epidemic and growing inadequacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Federal Works Agency, the Public Health Service, the District Commissioners, and other Government agencies and officials, charged with the responsibility of providing the people of Washington and its environs with adequate hospital facilities, prepare and submit to the Senate a report, within 10 days from the adoption of this resolution, setting forth plans and specifications which have been adopted, and those which are under study and consideration as to their feasibility, possibility, and availability, together with the present status of each project, actual or contemplated, and giving in detail the type of accommodations and facilities which are considered necessary to meet the situation existing and to rectify the conditions prevailing, including the supplies and equipment of all kinds necessary to an immediate carrying out of the program in full.

This resolution is intended to apply to all Government agencies, Federal and municipal, whose powers and authority embrace the final action required to actually put the necessary buildings, structures, and requisite personnel into operation, as well as to those agencies whose powers and authority require the giving of approval or sanction to obtain the necessary labor, materials, and supplies, to the end that the projects may, without delay, become an operating reality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is my resolution, and I ask that it be modified by increasing the time within which a report may be made from 10 days to 15 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is on page 3, line 7, instead of 10 days the Senator would make it 15 days?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would make it 15 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. The resolution requests various Federal authorities having to do with the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia to make a report to the Senate as to what progress, if any, they either are making or contemplate making.

Mr. McNARY. Is the Senator asking for the present consideration of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is before the Senate, having been carried over from a preceding day.

Mr. McNARY. So it comes up automatically.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It comes up automatically.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I inquire, What was the amendment the Senator from Nevada proposed?

Mr. McCARRAN. The original resolution provided that the report should be made within 10 days. I now ask to modify the resolution so that the report may be made to the Senate within 15 days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator think it necessary to increase the time another 5 days?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was thought that perhaps some of the agencies could not prepare their report within the time originally specified. Five days does not mean anything compared to the time which has already been wasted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The point I make is that this program was authorized months ago, and the money was made available for it. If they have not got their program ready to report by this time, I do not think 5 days will do them any great good. I am sorry the Senator is being so lenient about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it ought to be said that the Senator from Nevada is making the change at my suggestion, because I was not certain that the various authorities, the Commissioners and the whole list of those who have been dealing with the subject, would be able to make their report within 10 days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator realizes that this report was authorized and the money made available many months ago. The city is in dire need of hospital facilities, and, unless something is done about it, there will be created here a situation which will be shocking to the entire country.

Mr. BARKLEY. My only object was that I did not want these agencies to come in at the end of 10 days and say they had not time to make the report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let them come here in 10 days and say they have not had time. They have been working upon this matter for 10 months, and it is time they had some action to report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad to have the Senator from Wisconsin support our position, because he is entirely right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified by the Senator from Nevada.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

REPORT TO THE FARMERS OF AMERICA— STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement in the nature of a report to the farmers of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES G. PATTON ON FARMERS IN THE WAR

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Farmers and the War," delivered by James G. Patton, president, National Farmers' Union, at a meeting of the Iowa Farmers' Union at Des Moines, Iowa, September 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS TO THE WOMEN OF GERMANY BY MRS. LORNA FARRELL

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address to the women of Germany, delivered on September 27, 1942, by Mrs. Lorna Farrell, editor in chief of the magazine the Woman, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYER BY SGT. CONLEY M. ABBOTT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a prayer by Sgt. Conley M. Abbott, of Hemphill, W. Va., now stationed in New Caledonia, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like at this time to read for the Record a prepared statement from the Committee on Military Affairs. The statement is very short.

Mr. President, there was inserted in the Record on September 25 by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] a petition from Mr. Joseph Leib urging action on Senate resolution 234, together with some letters, a newspaper item, and copy of the resolution.

In reading this insertion in the Record anyone may arrive at the conclusion that the resolution was reported by the Military Affairs Committee, that \$25,000 had been provided for an investigation of airplane accidents, and that no action had been taken by the committee.

For this reason I desire to make a statement to clarify the record and to show that a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee had been active in the matter.

At this point I wish to repeat a statement which appears on page 3308 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 3, 1942:

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, day before yesterday I reported from the Committee on Military Affairs Senate Resolution 234 erroneously, and asked for the reference of the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I thought at the time that the resolution had been approved by the Committee on Military Affairs. I have since ascertained that I was mistaken. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for their approval before being referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. President, Senate Resolution 234 was not introduced and was not reported to the Senate as a result of committee action. It was introduced only in order that the subcommittee of which I was chairman might hold hearings and to enable the committee to determine what disposition should be made of the question.

Hearings were held and the matter of airplane accidents thoroughly studied by the subcommittee.

On yesterday, October 12, the full committee considered Senate Resolution 234 and, after very careful consideration, issued the following statement:

Appearing before the Committee on Military Affairs today were Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding the Army Air Forces, and Col. S. R. Harris, Army Air Forces, who has specialized in the investigation of airplane accidents and has charge of the special force of inspectors which makes these investigations.

For over 6 months this committee has been considering airplane accidents.

From the confidential information previously given the committee by experts in the field of Army aviation, all of which has been confirmed by General Arnold today, the committee is of the opinion that the investigations of airplane accidents have been and are now being conducted thoroughly and expeditiously by Army Air Force experts, and that the causes of accidents developed by investigations are being disseminated to all activities concerned in training and production with a view of obviating similar accidents as far as practicable.

This committee is assured that the accident rate is smaller than we had a reason to believe it would be, due to the tremendous increase in flying hours. We were further convinced on evidence presented that in no accidents has there been proven evidence of sabotage.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a statement from the United Dairy Committee, representing 23 States and 9 national associations, which met in Chicago last week.

"Unless speedy action is taken to insure dairy farmers of a reasonable supply of skilled help," Secretary Buskirk of this committee, writes me, "production of dairy products in 1943 will fall sharply below the present year, or even 1941."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement from this committee addressed to the President, General Lewis B. Hershey, Director Paul V. McNutt, and Secretary Claude R. Wickard.

While I have the floor I desire to call attention to some of the facts brought out in this letter. All over the country dairy herds are being sold—and all too frequently the cows are slaughtered—because the dairy operator cannot get skilled help, or any help, to aid him in continuing production of milk.

In Wisconsin, dairy production in August was nearly 10 percent below what it was in August 1941. Increase in slaughter of dairy cows was 20 percent higher than a year ago. In Kansas, as I pointed out to the Senate while we were debating the so-called anti-inflation bill, dairy herds are being dispersed and the cows slaughtered at a most distressing rate.

The United Dairy Committee has worked out a 10-point program, to which I invite the attention of the Senate. It is set forth in the letter which I send to the desk for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED DAIRY COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., October 9, 1942.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: Under the sponsorship of the United Dairy Committee, which committee represents the entire dairy industry in matters of general interest, a meeting was held in Chicago, Friday, October 2, to discuss the very serious situation with reference to farm labor, particularly that among dairy farmers.

The enclosed resolutions are the carefully considered position taken by the dairy industry with reference to this matter. They are worthy of the most careful attention you can give them.

Unless speedy action is taken to insure dairy farmers of a reasonable supply of skilled help, production of dairy products in 1943 will fall sharply below the present year, or even 1941.

Yours truly,

M. G. VAN BUSKIRK,
Secretary.

[Enclosure]

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Secretary CLAUDE R. WICKARD:

The fact that we have passed the peak of production of dairy products; the sharp decrease in production which in Wisconsin reached 9½ percent in August, as compared with August of 1941, in spite of the best pasture and feed conditions on record; the increase in the slaughter of dairy cows, which was 20 percent higher on the Milwaukee market in August than in 1941; together with similar conditions on other markets; the startling number of farm-dispersal sales; and the definite, personal reaction of more than 1,000 dairy farmers from the chief dairy producing States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio—and the expressed judgment of representatives of all phases of the industry from these 9 States, assembled in Chicago on this date, October 2, 1942, prompted the passage of the following resolutions.

A few points stand out with startling clearness. The production of dairy products will continue to decrease with increasing momentum as a result of the increasing shortage of farm labor due to industrial wages wholly out of proportion to the farmers' ability to pay and to the induction into the armed forces of irreplaceable, skilled agricultural workers so essential to the maintenance of agricultural production.

We assume, and we believe correctly, that the production of dairy products is one of the first essentials of the war program. This fact, together with those enumerated above, make mandatory certain adjustments in our present food-for-victory program. The continued production of the volume of dairy products necessary to the maintenance of full vigor of our armed forces, the supplying of food to sustain the general health of all our people, and to supply the demands of the lend-lease program hangs in the balance. The responsibility for making the necessary corrections and for setting up such programs as will maintain this necessary volume of dairy products rests squarely upon the policy-making authorities in Washington.

1. Winning the war: The first obligation of every American is to do his full share toward winning the war. To that end the dairy industry pledges its full and complete cooperation in every respect.

2. Production of food: The production of food is a first essential of our war effort. This must be faced fully and carefully and definite allocation of labor made to the production of essential farm products.

3. Critical defense areas: Conditions existing in critical defense areas where abnormal food consumption exists must be studied and definite allocations of manpower made so as to produce as much of the essential agricultural products as possible and thus meet transportation congestion.

4. Equality of manpower: A study of the equality of manpower on the basis of production in the total war effort is essential to efficient operation of the selective service, Manpower Commission, and the allocation of the necessary labor to the production of food, particularly dairy products.

5. Assurance to dairymen: Immediate action must be taken to assure dairy farmers of an adequate supply of skilled and competent labor to stop the sharp decreases in dairy production.

6. Balance: A complete over-all picture of the all-out war program in the allocation of manpower is necessary with definite relation to needs of the armed forces, their equipment, and to the necessary food supply.

7. Prices and wages: Industry and agriculture are out of balance. Agricultural commodity prices and industrial wages must be put into, and kept in, balance if maximum production of agricultural products is to be had.

8. Industrial wages, time, and effort: Industrial wages, time, and effort put forth must be set on a basis of all-out production. Present disparity of effort and return between agriculture and industry must be adjusted. Labor is patriotic and should be allowed to put forth full powers and time into the maximum effort rather than on the basis of a 40-hour week. The war effort cannot be prompted to the fullest extent if either industry or agriculture operates on a 40-hour week.

9. Voluntary enlistment: Voluntary enlistment in all armed services should be halted at once. This should be followed by a definite allocation of manpower to all war needs.

10. Recognition of essential service: Some form of recognition of the essential non-military service being rendered, and to be rendered, by farm labor and keymen in the dairy industry should be made. We recommend serious consideration of the definite assignment of manpower to the essential food industries, possibly through the formation of an agricultural corps.

The united dairy committee has repeatedly offered its services to the United States Department of Agriculture. It now offers the services of the best minds of the dairy industry to all branches of the Federal Government concerned therewith in helping to solve these tremendously vital problems.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED DAIRY COMMITTEE,
R. E. AMMON, Chairman.
M. G. VAN BUSKIRK, Secretary.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise for another purpose, but before proceeding in that regard I wish to express my concurrence with the statement made by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] regarding our distinguished colleague, GEORGE W. NORRIS. At a later date, in my own time and right, I expect to say a few words about Senator NORRIS, and express the hope that for the benefit

of the United States as a whole he will be retained in the Senate so long as he lives.

Like the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], I, too, am ready to vote on the question of lowering the draft age to 18 years. I have been ready to vote for a long time, whenever the Commander in Chief and the high command of the Army determine what they desire.

Mr. President, I wish to proceed now to the question which I rose to discuss. Ten days ago, after the end of a historic debate, we passed what was popularly known as the anti-inflation bill. It was passed after 2 or 3 weeks of debate in the Senate. I was one of those Senators the majority leader was kind enough to mention by name as having contributed to the result. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who was in charge of the bill, was also kind enough to give me some credit. I mention that merely in order that there may be no misunderstanding in relation to what I am about to say. I have approached this question without bias or prejudice or partisan feeling.

Throughout the debate, Mr. President, there constantly ran a current of lack of confidence in the administration of the law if and when the bill were enacted. On the floor of the Senate, in the cloak-rooms, in the lounge, in the reading room, 10 or 20 Senators said to me that they doubted whether the Price Administrator would fairly administer the law, no matter how plain the directions were, and some Senators went even to the extent of expressing a lack of confidence not only in the Price Administrator but, perhaps, in authority higher than the Price Administrator.

Unfortunately, the soundness of the basis for that lack of confidence has already been demonstrated. I say that with regret, not with any satisfaction. I shall not detain the Senate very long, but there is no subject before this body and before the country more important right now than whether clearly expressed mandates of the Congress, written into law, shall be carried out.

First, Mr. President, I wish to refer to the President's Executive order, paragraph 2 of title IV, appearing on page 7873 of the Federal Register for October 6. In that paragraph the President directs as follows:

In establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity—

Mark this language, Mr. President—appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price—

for certain payments.

Mr. President, I challenge the authority of the President lawfully to use that language, because, under the clear direction of the law, there are no appropriate deductions which can be made from the parity price.

On Monday of last week, following the President's order on Saturday, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and I had breakfast together, and we freely discussed the language of the President's order and the position taken.

Since that time the senior Senator from Alabama has made a very definite public statement, which was published in the newspapers, expressing the same thought I have expressed here, namely, that under the language of the act no power has been given the President to make the deductions he apparently has in mind.

Mr. President, the question of deductions from the parity price will doubtless arise later. There is a more immediate and urgent question presented by an order of the Price Administrator affecting wheat and flour which immediately concerns the wheat-producing States. The principle of the order concerns everyone. The application of it concerns immediately and importantly the wheat-growing States, and Kansas happens to be the leading State in the production of wheat as well as in the milling of flour.

I desire to read, as briefly as I can, the language of the law. I read now from a print of the bill as reported from the conference, which appears on page 7719 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 2, 1942. I shall refer to only a few sentences. I now read from section 3:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture. * * *

The bill states in subparagraphs (1) and (2) what those prices shall be. Subparagraph (1) refers to the parity price as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Subparagraph (2) refers to "the highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942."

Mr. President, the only lawful price which can be used by the President, the Price Administrator, or the Director of Economic Stabilization, is the higher of those two prices, and nowhere in the law is anything stated about deductions from those prices.

I now come to the question of the first order issued by the Price Administrator. On October 3, 1942, the day after the approval of the law, Mr. Henderson issued an order which appears on page 7914 of the Federal Register for Tuesday, October 6, 1942. It is carried under the following heading:

Part 1351—Foods and food products.

It then states that the ceiling price of flour shall be the highest price prevailing "during the 5 days prior to the date of the issuance of this regulation." Those 5 preceding days would be September 28, 29, 30, October 1 and October 2, or perhaps one more day in September and one less day in October.

Mr. President, the price of wheat upon which the flour price was based during those 5 days was \$1.02 a bushel on the farm. The parity price was \$1.34. Mr. Henderson directly violated the clear mandate given to him in this law, so recently enacted, when he fixed the ceiling upon flour prices at 76 percent of the parity price of wheat.

Let me read the section of the law which pertains to this matter. In this connection I will state to the Senators

who are interested in cotton, hogs, rice, tobacco, or any other commodity, that they will probably be confronted with this very question. By a coincidence, so far as I know, wheat happens to come first under the consideration of the Price Administrator, and this is what he did to us over our protests. The law provides:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefore equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2).

That is the law. That is the direction by the Congress to the President and to the Price Administrator. There is the clear mandate given by the legislative branch of the Government to the executive branch.

Mr. President, there have been informal conferences held between Senators interested in these questions, and we have prepared a letter addressed to Mr. Henderson. The letter is dated yesterday. Signatures of Senators began to be attached to the letter yesterday. They are still being attached. Some 15 or 16 signatures are now attached to the letters. I shall read a portion of the letter, and then ask that the entire letter be made a part of the RECORD. From the letter, which is addressed to Mr. Henderson, I quote:

We desire to call your attention to the following provisions of the act of Congress approved on October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living."

I shall skip over parts of the letter which quote directly portions of the law which I have already quoted and which are in the RECORD. The letter goes on to say:

The prices of flour prevailing in the period mentioned were based upon the current prices of wheat. * * * The price of wheat on the farm was reported by the Secretary of Agriculture on September 15, 1942, as averaging \$1.026 per bushel for the United States, and stated by the Secretary to be 76 percent of the parity price for wheat, which is \$1.344 per bushel.

Mr. President, these are figures supplied by the Secretary of Agriculture under direction of the law. I continue to read from the letter:

There has been little change in the market since September 15, and this figure may be accepted as representing the farm price of wheat upon which the ceiling prices of flour were based.

It seems to us that this amounts to a violation of section 3 of the act approved October 2, 1942.

We conclude the letter with this paragraph:

In order that we may consider possible future action with regard to these matters, we ask to be informed at your earliest convenience of your reasons for departure from the clear provisions of this act.

Mr. President, in addition to my own signature, that letter at this time bears the signatures of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the senior

Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN].

Perhaps before the letter is mailed today additional signatures will be added, and if they should be, Mr. President, I ask permission to add the additional signatures to the letter, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

(The letter is as follows:)

OCTOBER 12, 1942.

MR. LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator, Office of Price
Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: We desire to call your attention to the following provisions of the act of Congress approved on October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living."

"SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

"(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or

"(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials).

"And no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefore equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section."

We also call attention to the following provisions in part 1351 (foods and food products) in temporary maximum price regulation 22:

"In accordance with the direction of the President to take action which will stabilize prices affecting the cost of living, and under the authority therewith delegated by the President pursuant to the act of Congress approved October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living" (H. R.

7565), Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, and under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the Price Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, hereby issues this Temporary Maximum Price Regulation No. 22 establishing as the maximum prices for certain essential food products not heretofore subject to price control the prices prevailing for those products during the 5 days prior to the date of issuance of this regulation.

"1351.801 (8). Flour: All flour produced from wheat, rye, buckwheat, rice, corn, oats, barley, soybeans, and potatoes, and combinations thereof, including bleached, bromated, enriched, phosphated, and self-rising flours."

The prices of flour prevailing in the period mentioned were based upon the current prices of wheat (in many instances on lower wheat prices obtaining in July, August, or September, by reason of forward sales). The price of wheat on the farm was reported by the Secretary of Agriculture on September 15, 1942, as averaging \$1.026 per bushel for the United States, and stated by the Secretary to be 76 percent of the parity price for wheat, \$1.344 per bushel, reported by him at the same time. There has been little change in the market since September 15, and this figure may be accepted as representing the farm price of wheat upon which the ceiling prices of flour were based. It follows that the ceiling prices ordered by the Administrator are the equivalent of 76 percent of the current parity price for wheat.

It seems to us that this amounts to a violation of section 3 of the act approved October 2, 1942.

Manifestly, a flour price based on \$1.026 a bushel does not square with the provisions of the act requiring that no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise below the price which will reflect to the producer of this commodity, a price equal to the higher of (1) the parity price of such commodity (\$1.344) or to the highest price received for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

The supplemental order issued by you on October 8, as we understand it, protects the millers possibly to the extent of 8 or 10 cents a bushel, but does not change the fact that the maximum flour prices set do not reflect parity price to producers, as required in the act of October 2, 1942.

In order that we may consider possible future action with regard to these matters, we ask to be informed at your earliest convenience of your reasons for departure from the clear provisions of this act.

Respectfully,

Clyde M. Reed, Kansas; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; G. W. Norris, Nebraska; Chas. L. McNary, Oregon; Arthur Capper, Kansas; Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado; W. J. Bulow, South Dakota; John Thomas, Idaho; Hugh Butler, Nebraska; G. M. Gillette, Iowa; Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma; Burton K. Wheeler, Montana; C. Wayland Brooks, Illinois; Henrik Shipstead, Minnesota; D. Worth Clark, Idaho; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Chas. Gurney, South Dakota; Lloyd Spencer, Arkansas; Joseph H. Ball, Minnesota; E. D. Millikin, Colorado; R. E. Willis, Indiana; Rufus C. Holman, Oregon.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a news item appeared in a Washington newspaper dated October 11, under the headline—

Grain prices slump; uncertainty over ceilings blamed.

Then follows an Associated Press dispatch from Chicago beginning with these words:

Grain prices slumped 1 to 2 cents a bushel today to lows for the past month or longer in a general liquidation movement which brokers blamed on uncertainty as to price ceilings.

Mr. President, after giving much consideration to this matter, I prepared a memorandum on October 7 for the information of my associates and colleagues, which sets out as concisely as I know how all the facts which I have here discussed. I ask that the memorandum be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 7, 1942.

I

The anti-inflation bill was approved October 2, 1942. On October 3 the President issued an Executive order providing, among other things, that "the prices of agricultural commodities and of commodities manufactured or processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity should be stabilized, so far as practicable, on the basis of levels which existed on September 15, 1942," and further it was provided:

"2. In establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, appropriate deductions should be made from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies" (title IV).

On the same day the President addressed a letter to Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, directing him, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish ceiling prices for various foods, including flour, and in that letter said:

"In line with my recent message to the Congress, you should consider present governmental payments to agricultural producers, and subsidy payments in arriving at the minimum ceiling prices."

On the same day the President issued a statement with reference to the statute in which he said:

"It leaves the parity principle unimpaired."

II

On the same day (October 3, 1942) Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, issued an order, Temporary Maximum Price Regulation No. 22, establishing maximum prices for certain food products, including flour, corn meal, hominy, and hominy grits, to continue for a period of 60 days, after which permanent ceilings are to be ordered for the same commodities.

The maximum prices ordered are the sellers' highest prices charged during the period September 28, to October 2, 1942.

III

The prices of flour prevailing in the period mentioned were based upon the current prices of wheat (in many instances on lower wheat prices obtaining in July, August, or September, by reason of forward sales). The price of wheat on the farm was reported by the Secretary of Agriculture on September 15, 1942, as averaging \$1.026 per bushel for the United States, and stated by the Secretary to be 76 percent of the parity price for

wheat, \$1.344 per bushel, reported by him at the same time. There has been little change in the market since September 15, and this figure may be accepted as representing the farm price of wheat upon which the ceiling prices of flour were based. It follows that the ceiling prices ordered by the Administrator are the equivalent of 76 percent of the current parity price for wheat.

IV

The Anti-inflation Act contains the following:

"No maximum price should be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the higher of the prices specified in Clauses (1) and (2) of this section" (sec. 3).

Clause 1 prohibits any maximum price for any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to producers the parity price for such commodity.

V

It appears from the above that the Administrator, acting upon instructions from the President, has established ceiling prices for flour which reflect to the producers of wheat prices substantially below the parity price for wheat and, therefore, contrary to the express provisions of the Anti-inflation Act. Flour is a commodity processed in whole from wheat and, therefore, clearly within the provisions of the statute.

This statement can only be challenged if parity is determined to be subject to the deductions mentioned in the Executive order. The statutory provisions for parity negative any such theory.

VI

The Anti-inflation Act provides that the minimum ceiling for any agricultural commodity shall be "the parity price for such commodity" (sec. 3, clause (1)). This act is an amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which provides: "For the purposes of this act, parity prices shall be determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture as authorized by law" (sec. 3 (b)).

The Secretary of Agriculture publishes such parity prices on the 15th day of each month, and the last such publication, dated September 15, 1942, reported a parity price for wheat of \$1.344 per bushel.

If parity prices are subject to the deductions mentioned in the Executive order the current parity price for wheat would be \$1.11, as follows:

The reported parity price is.....	\$1.344
Deductions:	
Conservation payment.....	.099
Parity payment.....	.135
	.234
	1.11

Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 26, 1941, provided for loans to producers of wheat at 85 percent "of the parity price." The loan actually made on the 1942 crop was at the rate of \$1.14 per bushel, 85 percent of the established parity price of \$1.34.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 defines parity as follows (sec. 301 (a) (1)):

"Parity, as applied to prices for any agricultural commodity, shall be that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the

purchasing power of such commodity in the base period * * *"

Note the use throughout of the word "prices." Price is defined in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (sec. 302 (b)) as meaning "the consideration demanded or received in connection with the sale of a commodity."

VII

The 1942 wheat loan is based upon a price on the farm of \$1.14 per bushel equivalent to 85 percent of parity. The ceilings on flour are the equivalent of \$1.026 per bushel, or 76 percent of parity. Clearly this policy violates both the letter and the spirit of the act recently passed.

No ceiling should be fixed for flour at less than a price based on parity price for wheat of \$1.344 per bushel, plus "a generally fair and equitable margin" for processing, as required by section 3 of the Anti-inflation Act.

The policy announced in the President's order, and as followed in the order of Price Administrator Henderson, must have one of three results, namely:

(a) The farmer will have a base price of \$1.026 per bushel for his wheat, which is 76 percent of parity, or

(b) The Federal Government must subsidize the miller to the extent of any amount above \$1.026 per bushel he pays for wheat, or

(c) The Federal Government must take over and operate the flour-milling business.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Price Administrator, Mr. Henderson, issued a supplemental regulation some days after his original regulation. That helped the miller, but it did not help the farmer with respect to his wheat prices. I have dealt with that matter also in a memorandum dated October 12, 1942, in which I have tried to set out the facts. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 1942.

On October 3, 1942, Price Administrator Leon Henderson issued temporary maximum price regulation No. 22, in which he established maximum prices for "certain essential food products," including flour. Such maximum prices were fixed upon the level of the seller's maximum price charged by him during the period September 28 to October 2, 1942, inclusive. The term "highest price charged during the base period" was defined to mean the highest price which the seller charged for the product delivered by him during the base period.

On October 8, 1942, Mr. Henderson issued amendment No. 1 to temporary price regulation No. 22 to provide that "in the case of a seller of flour from wheat * * * in bulk and packaged in quantities greater than 3 pounds, 'highest price charged during the base period' means the highest price at which seller * * * contracted to sell for immediate or future delivery * * *"

Thus the maximum price was changed from the basis of the price for flour delivered in the base period to the basis of the price for flour contracted in the base period.

The reason for the amendment was that flour millers complained that the flour delivered in the base period had been contracted at earlier dates when the wheat market was lower and that the prices for such flour did not reflect the present wheat market with reference to which they would be obliged to contract new sales.

The effect of the original regulation can be determined from the following table:

Wheat prices (per bushel) on every Saturday, July 3, 1942, to Oct. 10, 1942, inclusive

Date	Chicago futures prices	Kansas City futures prices	Prices of cash wheat No. 1 Hard, 13.50 percent protein, at Kansas City
July 3, 1942	\$1.17½	\$1.08½	July.....\$1.09½
11, 1942	1.19½	1.11½	do.....1.10
18, 1942	1.16	1.09	do.....1.05½
25, 1942	1.19½	1.12½	September.....1.12½
Aug. 1, 1942	1.16½	1.09½	do.....1.09½
8, 1942	1.17½	1.10½	do.....1.12
15, 1942	1.18½	1.12½	do.....1.15
22, 1942	1.17½	1.11½	do.....1.13½
29, 1942	1.19½	1.13½	do.....1.15½
Sept. 5, 1942	1.23½	1.17½	December.....1.19
12, 1942	1.26½	1.19½	do.....1.20½
19, 1942	1.27½	1.21½	do.....1.23
26, 1942	1.28½	1.22½	do.....1.24½
Oct. 3, 1942	1.27½	1.21½	do.....1.24
10, 1942	1.23½	1.18½	do.....1.20½

It is a common practice in the milling business to contract for flour at harvest time for long periods in advance—even as long as 6 months, and most sales are made well in advance of delivery. Allowing for time in transit and other factors, practically no sales could be made and delivered in a 5-day period, therefore, the original ceiling was in practical effect based on the earlier sales when the wheat market was lower.

On October 3 the price of cash wheat as shown above was \$1.24 per bushel, but during August it ranges from \$1.09½ to \$1.15½, hence the statement by the Administrator that the amendment increased the ceiling price on flour from 10 to 15 percent. It did increase the ceiling price on flour but did not have any effect on the price of wheat.

The amended ceiling, approximately \$1.24 per bushel, basis Kansas City, therefore, is not greatly different from the prices prevailing in September. The Department of Agriculture reported the average price of wheat on the farms as of September 15 as being \$1.026 per bushel. It follows, therefore, that the amended flour ceilings represent approximately that price for wheat.

If a generous allowance be made for a lag in time it would hardly exceed 10 cents per bushel, which assumption would bring the average farm price of wheat to \$1.13 per bushel. The 1942 loan rate on wheat is \$1.14 per bushel (farm average). The loan rate fixed at Kansas City is \$1.27 per bushel. Compare the table above.

The September parity price for wheat is \$1.344 on the farm. The amended ceilings represent a farm price of \$1.026 or possibly a little above that figure. Wheat is still selling below the loan price of \$1.14. Obviously, the ceilings may represent a wheat price somewhat over \$1.026—it most certainly cannot exceed \$1.14. In the most liberal view that can be taken, the ceilings reflect a wheat price in excess of 20 and probably 25 cents per bushel less than parity.

The millers are afforded some temporary relief by the amended order. However, as the supply of free wheat offered by farmers diminishes the demand will increase the price. An increase of 5 cents in the wheat market means 25 cents per barrel. Much less of an advance will seriously affect most millers and cause them to refuse flour sales. The effect upon the wheat market is obvious.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the question of good faith is involved in this matter. The Congress wrote certain things plainly into the law. All the way through the debate on the measure there constantly arose expressions of lack of con-

fidence in its administration. I happen to be one of those Senators who helped to persuade the doubters to accept the bill and go along. I confess, not with pride, but with regret, that those fears were well founded. I say here and now that the President's order contained some things which are without any foundation in law, and that the first act of the Administrator in undertaking to deal with these articles processed from agricultural commodities is a direct, flagrant violation of the law, and I for one shall use my position and my voice in the Senate at least to make an effort to see that the President, highly placed as he is, and the Price Director, shall conform to the law.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to endorse the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with reference to what I would call the bungling way in which the price law has thus far been administered, at least with reference to too many commodities which originate with the farmer. What the distinguished Senator from Kansas has had to say as to the wheat order and how it affects directly the producer of wheat can be said with respect to what will result from the anticipated order in regard to meat. If what we hear suggested should happen, the meat producers will be affected far more seriously than the producers of wheat.

I sincerely hope that the rumor which has reached us may be false, for it has resulted in a great disservice to the country in this way: One feed yard which annually finishes as prime beef 35,000 head of cattle is empty today because of the confusion, because of the doubt which surrounds the industry. Most feed yards which have cattle in them do not have to exceed 50 percent of the number ordinarily to be found there at this time of the year. We are going to find ourselves in a most serious situation, one which few persons can visualize at this moment. I spoke of this months ago. I have spoken a number of times on the subject, so I need not detain Senators longer at this moment.

Mr. President, I have not burdened the RECORD with many telegrams and letters which I have received on this and kindred subjects, but I shall ask the Senate to bear with me while I read one telegram which I received this morning from the president and the State director of the National Reclamation Association, an organization which is now in session in the city of Denver. It is dated yesterday, is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

DENVER, COLO., October 13, 1942.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER:

Shortage labor irrigated farming, particularly sugar beets, dairying, livestock; acute and alarming. Production program vital, war crops in West imperiled. Under average weather conditions, substantial percentage 1942 sugar beets will be frozen in ground unless additional workers supplied immediately. Montana 1,800, Utah 2,000, Idaho 2,500, South Dakota 300, Colorado will advise number

Wednesday, Wyoming 500, Nebraska 500, North Dakota and Minnesota 300, Oregon 500. Before Members return home for election campaigns urge efforts remedial measures, such as deferment labor engaged beet, dairy, livestock production; stabilizing farm workers present jobs; more intensive efforts recruiting evacuee, alien, prison camp labor, procurement Mexican workers.

O. S. WARDEN,
President, National
Reclamation Association.
H. D. STRUNK,
State Director.

Mr. President, any one of us could read to the Senate hundreds, if not thousands, of messages which tell the same story. So I am sincerely hopeful that the administration—those in authority and in charge of handling of the labor problem—will take this matter under serious consideration at the earliest possible moment; otherwise it will be too late. The war program does not consist entirely of drafting men, arming them, and sending them to the battle front. The war program includes the production of food to maintain those at the front.

The size of the Army we are preparing has been the subject of discussion a number of times on the floor of the Senate. I am not one of those who believe that we are going to lose the war. We are going to win the war; but we shall win it much more quickly if we proceed along a reasonable line with reference to the enlistment of an army. I do not believe that we need an army of 10,000,000 or 13,000,000. Others, who are possibly better informed, may differ with me; but my opinion is that if we attempt to take from the farms and industries of the country an army of even 10,000,000, we shall break down in part of the war production program at home. At this time the production of food is just as essential as is the winning of battles.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to make the basis of my remarks an article written by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, published in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, October 8.

I agree with my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] that the prophets of gloom who go about the country telling the people that for one reason or another we are going to lose the war do not contribute to winning the war. I never saw a people, a team, or an individual engaged in a contest of any kind helping themselves by fighting a losing game. I think it is perfectly proper to say to the people that certain things are necessary and ought to be done in order to make our side more effective in the cause in which it finds itself engaged. However, I do not like to see the prophets of gloom seize upon isolated instances, or things which may be in the nature of "gripes." All of us have "gripes." The "gripe" is a great American institution. Everyone, whether he is in the Army or is a civilian, has a right to "gripe" about anything; and we make full use of that privilege. If it is only a

"gripe" we soon get over it; but if it reaches such a point that it handicaps either the civilian or the military effort, it becomes so serious that some notice should be taken of it.

I am sorry the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is not present. The "gripe" of his friend was so important that he referred to it for the second time in the past 8 or 10 days. I do not know how important it is whether sash are painted before they are installed or afterward; but I doubt whether that factor would make much contribution to winning the war.

Recently, in company with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I made a visit to some of the military establishments, both within and outside the continental United States. We went to the Aleutian Islands, bare islands with no trees, rising out of the Bering Sea and the Pacific Ocean, with mountains rising from their shores. There young Americans are getting up at 4 o'clock in the morning and working until 10 o'clock at night, asking nothing except a letter from home, a package of cigarettes, and a bar of candy. If other Senators could make such a trip and see what we saw, it would immediately occur to them that there is something to this war besides a "gripe" at home about an isolated instance which, of course, we all regret.

Mr. Lawrence says that he has been making an investigation of the set-up of the Military Establishment of the United States. He says:

Perhaps the most important thing for Government to acquire and retain in wartime is the confidence of the people—confidence that the men at the top whose moves are necessarily cloaked in the utmost secrecy are operating solely with the idea of winning the war, irrespective of any other consideration.

Mr. Lawrence says—and I agree with him—that those at the top in the Military Establishment of the United States today are men who have won their positions through sheer merit, and who are entitled to the positions they occupy. If supported by the people of the United States, they will be successful sooner than if they are opposed by any considerable number of the people of the United States. To quote Mr. Lawrence again:

The war is being managed by the men who know war best, the men who have spent a lifetime in the armed services and have come to their places in the high command through sheer merit and outstanding performance.

Broadly speaking, for us the strategy of making war is in the hands of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief; for the British it is in the hands of Mr. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire; the Russians and our other allies have men designated by them to represent them in the Inter-Allied Council. They have adopted a plan of strategy. We are fighting all over the world. This is a

global war; and while we recognize that certain things ought to be done in certain localities, none of us wishes to have those things done at the expense of some more important sector of the war.

These men execute the war policies. Mr. Lawrence says:

It can be stated unequivocally that President Roosevelt has given to the members of the United States chief of staff his fullest support and that he has really followed meticulously the policy of noninterference in military matters.

The significance of this analysis is that if the high command of the United States decides upon secrecy with respect to past engagements or future plans or operations the public may rest assured that the reasons motivating such a decision bear relation only to necessary deception with respect to the enemy and the safeguarding of troops or materials in transit. The American people can have the utmost confidence in the high command which has emerged as the management staff of military and naval operations.

Mr. President, in order to win this war, we must have the finest trained army that we have ever had in the history of the country. We are about to obtain such an army. We have been training an army for a comparatively short time. A full year is required to train a young man to be a member of the Air Corps, the Artillery, or one of the other important services in the Army of the United States. If we give our young men such training, they will have a better chance to survive than they would have if we were to put them into battle after 6 months' training, as we have been forced to do in other wars.

During the war 25 years ago young men were frequently sent into battle after being in a quiet sector for a short time following only 6 months of training.

I think it is time to stop listening to the so-called armchair strategists, the before-the-war military experts, who told us that nothing would happen to us, that all we had to do was to fold our arms and stay on this side of the ocean; that the oceans would protect us, that nothing would happen to us, and that no nation or combination of nations could whip us or threaten us.

I have no quarrel with them for making a mistake. Anyone is likely to be mistaken about what may happen in a world such as that in which we live today. In many instances that mistake prevented the people of the country from being as well prepared as they would have been if they had followed the leadership of the President of the United States, who continually implored both branches of Congress to make sufficient appropriations to meet eventualities and emergencies if and when they should occur.

It should be repeated that the President did not want this war. No citizen of this country wanted the war. Many of us were so anxious to avoid the war that we did not take the pains to do what we should have done in order best to equip and prepare ourselves for this terrible catastrophe. Now that it is here, and we have been in it for less than a year, we are about to seize the offensive all over the earth. In doing so, we shall keep the war away from the United States, and away from its people.

So far, except in a few isolated instances, the people of this country have not suffered the tortures of war, as have the people of almost every other country on earth. The President and the military leaders are right in carrying the war to the enemy, because if we do not carry the war to the enemy, ultimately we shall have no choice except subjugation to his wishes. In other words, if we do not carry the war to him he will carry the war to us; and we cannot win the war on the defensive.

Mr. President, I wish I could tell the things which, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I have an opportunity to know. It is not that we do not want the people to know these things but, if the newspapers get the news, the people get the news, and the enemy gets the news, the result may be the loss of thousands of American boys who would otherwise be saved.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. ROSIER. This morning I read in the newspaper that Secretary Stimson had ordered an Army officer who was on the program of the Town Meeting of the Air not to appear and not to discuss the matter which he proposed to discuss on that program.

I am wondering about the wisdom of such a policy. I understand that the Army officer who was to appear on that program is a very ardent supporter of air power as a means of winning the war. The Secretary advanced as a reason for prohibiting that speech that a speech of that nature on a program so widely heard would create disunity. Are we to understand that there is intense rivalry among the various departments of defense, such as the Air Corps, the Navy, and the Army?

A few days ago I went to a news-reel theater, and I was disturbed more than I have been in quite a long time. A General Somervell—I had heard of him—had gone into a motion-picture studio and had produced a news reel; in other words, he made a speech which was reproduced in a news reel. I presume that that news reel is circulated all over the United States—probably in hundreds, if not in thousands, of theaters. The general said, first of all, that we have failed on every front in this war. That was the first part of his remarks. He said—and these were his very words—

We have failed on every front in this war.

I should not dispute his authority for making that statement. Perhaps he knows more about how we are getting along in the war than I do, but the thing I resented was the second part of his speech. He had a right to speak on military matters, although if we are losing the war it is his fault and the fault of his colleagues and associates, because certainly the Members of the Congress have furnished all the support they have been asked to furnish, and if we are not winning the war it is the fault of the men in charge of our armed forces, to whom we have given every support. I resented particularly the second part of the general's speech, in which he discussed elec-

tions. I wish to say that if civilians have no right to pass judgment on military matters, I take a similar position regarding the right of military men to pass judgment upon political matters, and I say that military men should stay out of politics. I make that statement very positively. I gathered from the second part of the general's speech that he did not think we should have any elections, that he thought that elections were a general nuisance, and that we should forget them. I do not think that was any of his business; I do not think that he, as a military man, has any business discussing the elections in this country, because, certainly, elections are a vital part of our American way of doing things. We have had elections from the beginning of the Government, and in elections we have the process of democratic government. We had elections during the Civil War; we had them during the first World War. I resent having a general deliver a screen speech in which he ridicules the people of the country for being bothered by elections or for paying any attention to them. That is none of his affair.

In recent weeks there has been much said about there being too much talk. I think that if the military men will attend to their own affairs, and will keep their hands out of the political affairs of the country, they will be in much better order. It seems to me that there are too many generals running around the country talking at banquets and declaring what is wrong with the country in a civilian way. I suppose it is no more than right that we should do a little talking about what is wrong with them. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to say to my friend the Senator from West Virginia that I am so anxious that we succeed in winning the war that I do not like to see us spend so much time fighting each other. We are so busy fighting each other that it is no wonder that sometimes we fail to whip the enemy.

If the Secretary of War wants to prevent an Army colonel from delivering a speech which, in his opinion, would be hurtful to the cause, I think he is justified in doing so; because when a man is in the Army—and let me say that I have been in the Army, and that I now hold a Reserve officer's commission—he has to obey the instructions of his superior; otherwise it would be impossible to run an army.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Senator's statement I am wondering whether he would go so far as to say that there should be a suppression of a fact which, if known to the country, might inure to the benefit of the war effort?

Mr. CHANDLER. No. I think it is true in this country and in every other free country that any citizen has a right to criticize. I think the Senator from West Virginia has a right to criticize General Somervell, and I think General Somervell has a right to criticize the Senator; but I think all of us should give up that right, because we have a dangerous enemy to fight, and if we fight each other we shall not whip the enemy.

Both the Senator and the General have a right to criticize each other, but they should not do so. General Somervell is one of the best officers who has been developed in the Army of the United States. I do not know how capable he is as a politician. He may be a bad politician, but he is a good soldier; and in a short time he has risen in rank from lieutenant colonel to lieutenant general in charge of supplies. He has a way of getting things done, and that is what I am interested in. I should be willing to have him fuss a little at me about elections if he arranges to whip the Japs and the Germans, although I say that I wish he would not take part in any fussing.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. With reference to the Senator's remarks about General Somervell, let me say that I recall that at the time when the general was promoted, statements appeared in the newspapers to the effect that he was not only a good general but a good politician.

Mr. CHANDLER. That may be; he may be both. However, I think the important thing to us is that he be a good general. I think he is a good general.

Of course, if the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate who think they are good military strategists and military geniuses want to conduct the war, and if the generals in command of the Army want to play politics, my judgment is that we shall be in a most unhappy predicament in a short time. [Laughter.]

We want to win the war. The Senator from West Virginia says that if we lose the war the responsibility for losing it will be upon the general and his military associates. I do not think so. I think that the job of the American people is to produce the things which the military forces need. Some of us tried to do it. Some did not try to do it, but I do not censure them. The fact remains that before the war came we should have been working to provide the things necessary for the defense of our country.

I say that the record shows that we made the most phenomenal progress in supply and production and training that ever has been made by any country in the history of the world. We are not losing the war. We are winning the war. It does not do any good to say that we are losing the war, because that is not so.

Mr. ROSIER. General Somervell said in his speech that we were losing it.

Mr. CHANDLER. That might be his idea about it; and certain persons might make such a statement in order to cause someone else to do more than he was doing, and to lend greater assistance in helping to get the job done. I do not know the general's reason for making the speech. However, it is my conviction that the American people do not have to be told fairy stories or bedtime stories. They want to be told the truth. Wherever it is necessary to withhold the truth from them because it is not prudent that the information be furnished the enemy it should be withheld.

In a democracy processes are slow, much slower than in a country controlled

by a dictator, who goes out in the morning and says, "You do this, you do this, and you do this," and there is no election about it, because if they do not do what they are told their heads are cut off. In such countries there is no argument, because if the people do not do what they are told they are destroyed and someone else is called upon to do the work.

In our country we are about to have an election. It is none of a general's business whether we have an election. The people of the United States want to have an election; they want to have a chance to vote for the men whom they prefer to have in office. In my opinion, they will vote for men who by their actions have demonstrated that they know this is one world, that we are in this war, and that they are willing to see far enough ahead not only to win the war, and to do whatever must be done in order to win it, but also to do whatever must be done in order to make sure that 25 or 30 years from now there shall not be another war in which the little children and babies of today would have to fight.

I am willing to do whatever is necessary to be done, regardless of the consequences. Frequently men in public office make mistakes, and cast votes that their constituents do not approve, with the result that their constituents turn them out of office, as they have a right to do. However, frequently the people have said later on, "We know now that we made a mistake in turning you out, and that we should not have done what we did." Then a man grows in stature in the opinion of the people.

Mr. President, it cannot be assumed that one American is more anxious than another that our Nation win the war. Of course, we have Army and Navy football games; jealousy between the services. Of course there is, but we do not want it to go to extremes.

I have had an opportunity to visit the boys in the Aleutians and in the Northwest Territory, and I have had an opportunity to see them in Alaska, and to realize the hardships they endure with smiles on their faces. All they want to know is that back home we know what is going on up there, and that we know what they are doing. They ask very little.

All the instances that are picked out—the isolated instances I have seen fit to call "gripes"—are relatively unimportant; although if they are magnified and added to, much harm might be done. One citizen might lay such great stress on an isolated instance that the whole war effort would be handicapped.

I say to the Senate that at this moment we have a finer army and a better trained army than we have ever had at any time in all our history. We are improving our position everywhere in the world. If we continue to give our support to the men in our armed forces and to the President and his officers—his high command—we shall win the war. If we do not win it with them, we shall not win it with anyone else, because we do not have time to wipe out the past and start over again.

I understand that the man who has been criticized has not always been a

supporter of the President or of his administration. However, a careful investigation has been made, and it has been found that the present set-up is not only effective but efficient—controlled by men of merit who know the military situation. If they came to me and said—and if I believed what they said, and I do believe it—"Senator, it is necessary that this be done in order to get the job done," I should not hold back a thing they asked for, because I do not know what is needed, and I do not think any considerable number of the people of the country know, or that any considerable number of the Members of the Senate or Members of the other House know. When those in charge tell us, "We need this and we need that for the armed forces," I think all of us should get together and should give all we can give to help the country defeat our dangerous and treacherous enemies.

Mr. President, I close with this word: In view of the statements which have been made by certain persons—and I concede they have a right to make them—that, for one reason or another, this man is doing what he ought not to do, that some other man is doing what he ought not to do, and that we are losing the war, I thought it appropriate to say that they are not contributing to the success of the great undertaking in which we are engaged.

I say again that we will win the war quicker, and we will save more lives, if we have faith in our cause, faith in Almighty God, and faith in the leaders we have—the President of the United States and his staff and those who are in charge of waging the war against our enemies. If we have faith in them and back them wholeheartedly, victory will come sooner, and then we will make a peace which will guarantee for the future a wider distribution of goods and services to all the peoples of the earth.

In that peace America will say to all the world, "This is one world; we are a part of it, and we shall see to it that never again shall the peace be broken; we shall be strong enough, at all times in the future, to prevent the recurrence of war." That is what the people want, and they are ready to make any sacrifice to bring it about. They do not need to be brow-beaten. All they need to do is to have their Commander in Chief make the request of them. Any man who will give his son or give his life, will give anything else. Let the people know what is wanted, and then let everyone in this country talk win, and quit being prophets of gloom and doom, because that does not contribute to the ultimate victory for which we are all so anxious and for which we so devoutly pray. God willing, if we will adopt that course, we shall succeed, as we must, in the interest of the common security of the people of our great country.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

5503) to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its first amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the second amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

PAT McCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,

EMANUEL CELLER,

EARL C. MICHENER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, earlier in the day I obtained unanimous consent to report an appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate between now and Thursday or Friday, or whatever the time may be. Two or three amendments to the bill propose legislation. In accordance with rule XL, I send to the desk a notice in writing.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. McKELLAR is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7672) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 12, after line 22, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

"The second proviso clause under the head 'Office of Price Administration' in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words: 'shall be so administered during the fiscal year 1943 as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such Administration during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and'."

Page 22, after line 2, insert:

"UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

"On and after November 1, 1942, section 2 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, approved June 27, 1942, shall not apply to the position of Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission so long as the office is held by the present incumbent."

Page 24, after line 21, insert:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Construction and equipment of helium plants: For an additional amount, fiscal years 1943 and 1944, for 'Construction and equipment of helium plants,' to constitute one fund with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, such fund to be available for all the objects for which said appropriation is available, including transportation of personnel engaged in work authorized thereunder between helium plants and related facilities and communities that provide adequate living accommodations when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Interior after a determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means and that the exercise of this authority will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned, and

the purchase and exchange of passenger-carrying trucks, trailers, and busses used for such purposes without charge against the limitation on the purchase of passenger-carrying automobiles hereinafter specified, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$16,600 on expenditures for purchase (including exchange) of passenger-carrying automobiles is hereby increased to \$33,250, and the limitation of \$30,000 on expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to \$80,000."

Page 24, after line 21, insert:

"The authority granted by the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, to the Secretary of the Interior, or any official to whom he may delegate such authority, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, to appoint skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, and other persons engaged in a recognized trade or craft, including foremen of such groups, employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby extended to include appointment of such employees at helium plants and properties related thereto."

Page 28, after line 21, insert:

"Flood control, general: For the protection of numerous defense plants now engaged in making war equipment and located along the Arkansas River, between the cities of Tulsa and Sand Springs, Okla., the Bureau of the Budget is hereby directed to release the funds in the total sum of \$513,000 heretofore appropriated (the sum of \$300,000 earmarked in the third supplemental national defense appropriation bill and the sum of \$213,000 earmarked in War Department civil functions appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943) and immediately following the issuance of such order of release of such impounded funds, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is directed to proceed to the completion of the local flood protection works substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$513,000, and as approved and authorized by the Flood Control Act, 1941 (Public Law 228, 77th Cong., 1st sess.)."

Page 28, after line 23, insert:

"Sec. 201. The limitation of \$925 specified in section 405 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and any similar limitation specified in any other appropriation act for the fiscal year 1943 may be exceeded by such amount as the Secretary of War, in the case of the War Department, the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of the Navy Department, the Commissioners, in the case of the government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in the case of other essential governmental needs, may determine necessary to obtain satisfactory light-weight and medium-weight motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, but in no event shall the price so paid for any such vehicle exceed the maximum price for such vehicle established by the Office of Price Administration, and in no event more than \$1,500."

Page 28, after line 23, insert:

"Sec. 202. Section 301 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (act of September 9, 1940, 54 Stat. 884), be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 301. That during the period of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, so much of section 6 of the act approved May 6, 1939 (53 Stat. 683), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 989), as requires the head of each executive department and independent establishment (other than the Post Office Department) to submit to the Postmaster General quarterly

reports relating to mail matter which has been transmitted free of postage, is hereby suspended."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7672, the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. John L. Hall, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 14, 1942.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received October 13, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class seven and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. (temporary) William T. Clement to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

Capt. (temporary) Russell Duncan to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June 1942.

Gordon R. Lockard, a citizen of Colorado, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of August 1941.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942:

Thomas T. Grady, a citizen of Georgia.

Leonard G. Lawton, a citizen of Florida.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942:

Victor R. Bisceglia, a citizen of New York.

Robert W. Dyer, a citizen of Iowa.

Robert F. Thompson, a citizen of New Mexico.

John D. Mattox, a citizen of Georgia.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of July 1942:

Richard W. Schutt, a citizen of Washington.

James P. Wilson, a citizen of Oregon.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942:

Alfred E. Holland, a citizen of Tennessee.
Monson J. McCarty, a citizen of New York.
Robert L. Racine, a citizen of Illinois.
Wyman W. Trotti, a citizen of South Carolina.

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of August 1942:

First Sgt. Charles S. Robertson
Platoon Sgt. James C. Fettes
Platoon Sgt. Donald R. France
The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of August 1942:

Robert H. Venn, a citizen of Ohio.
William B. Onley, Jr., a citizen of Delaware.
Edgar L. Allen, a citizen of Virginia.
Charles H. LeClaire, a citizen of Michigan.
Edwin H. Klein, a citizen of New Jersey.
George W. Ellis, Jr., a citizen of California.
Alfred J. McCartney, a citizen of California.

David W. Bridges, a citizen of Florida.
Burdette A. Ogle, a citizen of California.
William K. Gillespie, a citizen of Texas.
Robert D. Mellin, a citizen of Indiana.
Jefferson D. Smith, Jr., a citizen of Louisiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of September 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou knowest, our Father, how often we pray for things far beyond our power; help us to have a faith to believe that Thou dost hear our prayer and desirest to help Thy children. As we go forth today touching the lives of our fellows, make us a blessing to all. Grant that we may swell the tides of the coming day when the world shall be free with the recognition that in the kingdom of the soul obedience to Thee is strength and life and disobedience is weakness and death.

Let Thy fatherly goodness and kindly providence bless all the homes of the Congress and such as are separated. Grant that they may minister unto that precious life temple into which time is sweeping our dreams and hopes. Whatever is pure and enriching in thought and character is identified with the immortal tradition of the home. Here the cloudy summits of our times must be cleared, bidding us to surpass the heroes of yesterday. Kindle in all hearts such a flame that shall consume the dross of evil passion and bind us together with the cords of brotherly cooperation; Oh, hear our humble prayer for the sake of Him, our Lord and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmena, Vice President of the Philippines, before the Amer-

ican Women's Voluntary Services of New York City, October 9, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from an invitation to bid on surplus property by the Procurement Division of the Treasury. The title of the extension is "Ten Bags of Rags Wrapped Up in Red Tape—Weight Unknown."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I obtained unanimous consent to insert in the Record speeches made by the Speaker, and by the majority leader, also by Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. McKEOUGH. I find that the cost will be a little more than is permitted under the rules. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in that way, notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to know what the cost of that will be.

Mr. SABATH. Around \$125.

Mr. RICH. It must be a pretty good speech.

Mr. SABATH. They were all good speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and insert therein an address delivered by the Attorney General of the United States yesterday; also, an editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, October 13, 1942, to accompany the address delivered by Attorney General Biddle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE NATION'S MANPOWER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes, after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as with everything else, we must do regarding manpower whatever is necessary to win the war. In my judgment, it could be solved in the following manner:

First. To men with dependents grant a secure draft status in the form of indefinite deferment, provided such men take and keep the jobs in which they are most needed and which they are best qualified to fill. The deferment would end only if he quit the job—but it would end then.

Second. Put this system in effect in agriculture first so as to induce family men to stay in agriculture or return to it if they have left it.

Third. At the same time make it plain to employers and single men of proper age that deferment of such men may be ended at any time they are needed to fill draft quotas. In this way we would soon have a situation where men deferred from military service would in most cases have two reasons for deferment: First, family dependents; and, second, occupational deferment.

THE NEW TAX BILL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a Treasury statement showing that on October 6, in 77 days or 11 weeks, the United States Treasury has gone in the red \$13,478,191,797.77—a terrible deficit. That is over \$1,300,000,000 a week. An unheard of deficit by any country of the world. Where will you get the money? You have now before you a tax bill—H. R. 7378—consisting of 601 pages that is supposed to raise \$6,291,000,000. That will take care of the deficits for only 5 weeks at the rate you are going—a terrible situation. If you are ever going to do things sensibly—if you will ever come to a balanced Budget—then in order to raise money you will have to have another tax bill, or you will have to cut expenses and the easiest and most sensible way to raise money is to cut down on your expenses, consolidate Government offices, and eliminate things that are not essential in government. Goodness knows there are many such departments, much inefficiency and great opportunities to cut down Government expenses. That is the only way you will ever get to a sensible business administration, and unless you do that and start to do it now, you are going to find out that you will get into the most difficult position this Nation has ever been in. In fact, you are there now. That is one way to assist in getting out of a bad situation. It takes nerve and common sense to do the right thing for your country. The longer it is delayed in cutting down expenses the harder it is going to be to save the country. Let us do it now. I will do my part, will you?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

NATURALIZING AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND MARINES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate, in celebrating Columbus Day, for Congress to consider providing a speedy and effective method to naturalize approximately 75,000 American soldiers and sailors of Italian origin now serving in the armed forces of the United States.